

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—*Subscribers desiring to receive their copies post free are requested to forward the amount of their subscription (£2 8s. for the first year, including the WEEKLY REPORTER from the 8th of November last) by Post-office order or otherwise, payable to the Secretary of the Company, Mr. WILLIAM SHAEN.*

TO NON-SUBSCRIBERS.—*Gentlemen who desire to be supplied with the future numbers of this paper are requested to send their orders to the Office of the Company, 18, Carey-street, Lincoln's Inn, London, W. C.*

We cannot notice any communication unless accompanied by the name and address of the writer.

It is particularly requested that any error or delay in the transmission of this Journal to Subscribers may be immediately communicated to the Editor.

THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

LONDON, OCTOBER 31, 1857.

PROGRESS OF THE REGISTRATION QUESTION.

One result of the Conferences held at Birmingham will undoubtedly be this: that the minds of the laity, and especially of landowners, will be attracted to the consideration of a subject which has hitherto been looked upon almost exclusively as the domain of lawyers. We publish elsewhere an abstract of a paper read at the meeting by Mr. Wakefield, which places this question of facilitating the transfer of land in an aspect most interesting to the politician, by showing that it is intimately connected with social and economical improvement. Mr. Wakefield argues that the strenuous industry of the population is essential to the national prosperity; that the desire of possessing property is the most powerful incentive to exertion; and that, among all sorts of property, none is so much desired as land, and, therefore, whatever tends to give greater freedom to the acquisition of land must necessarily add to the greatness and strength of England.

We believe that opinions differ very much as to the probable effect upon ordinary conveyancing transactions of such an alteration of the law as is proposed in the report on registration. But surely it is possible to conceive, that, under a simpler and more expeditious system of land transfer, there might be a very great increase in the number of small purchases. At Birmingham the lawyers told the laymen that the practice of conveyancing might be so far freed of technicalities, as to enable land to be transferred with the same facility as stock. The immense value of such a change as this, supposing it to be practicable, was immediately appreciated by Lord John Russell, the President of the Section, and he declared himself, with a good deal of emphasis, to be an advocate of the proposed reform. Now, it appears to us to be most desirable that the importance of this incident should be adequately appreciated by all our readers. We believe that if any leading politician of any party should be induced on a leisure day to master the main outlines of this question, he would become thenceforward a supporter of the scheme of registration. Can anybody doubt that all the leading social reformers collected at the Conferences at Birmingham would, if the point were fully and clearly put to them, prove unanimous in their agreement with Lord John Russell? The difficulties which lawyers apprehend will never be appreciated by laymen; and the intelligent public, as it learns to think upon this subject, will answer professional objections with the old adage, that "where there is a will there is a way."

For our own part, we are persuaded that a great and beneficial change will sooner or later be introduced into the law of real property by the adoption of a plan of registration. We think that the national benefits of this change would be very great, and that Mr. Wake-

field, in his paper, has not exaggerated the value to the community of the stimulus to productive industry that would be thus supplied. We do not leave out of view the possible operation of the scheme upon the immediate interests of practitioners. Happily, however, we are by no means singular in holding that the expediency of law reforms should be considered irrespective of these apprehended consequences. At Birmingham, the topic of land transfer was succeeded by a discussion upon bankruptcy, and here the emoluments of solicitors were dealt with in the most uncompromising spirit. In bankruptcy, says Mr. Lloyd, in a paper which we elsewhere publish, solicitors' charges constitute on an average one-third of the expense of administration, and a large proportion of these charges are made for duties, which, not being strictly professional, might be more cheaply performed otherwise, or which need not be performed at all. Now, this proposition may perhaps startle some of our readers who meet with it for the first time; but the paper containing it was prepared and read with the concurrence of many lawyers, and we believe that its conclusions will be seen on reflection to be indisputable. If it be the fact that the enormous expense of proceedings in bankruptcy renders a resort to the court the exception rather than the rule, is it not likely that a large reduction of the legal and other charges would render such proceedings, in all cases of insolvent traders, the rule rather than the exception? And can it be doubted that the practitioner would gain on the nine cases thus brought before the court far more than he would lose upon the one which now is overburdened with extravagant or unnecessary fees? A simpler and more economical procedure before tribunals which, either by the aid of the county courts, or in some other manner, should be rendered more readily accessible—this is a reform which the trading interests of the country imperatively demand, and which we believe would largely increase the emoluments of solicitors.

The instance of bankruptcy is only one of many where lawyers have wisely discerned and acted upon the principle, that what is best for the community is also most advantageous in the long run for their own order. But we have chosen this example because there are insolvent traders in every part of England; and a bankruptcy tribunal is, or ought to be, accessible in every town and district. The subject is, therefore, one that concerns provincial practitioners fully as much as it does their London brethren; and we would ask the former to consider whether Mr. Lloyd's paper does not suggest reflections which are by no means inapplicable to the subject of land transfer? Might not the "unpopularity" which is ascribed to the Courts of Bankruptcy be predicated with almost equal justice of the existing system of conveyancing? Is there not some reason to believe, that, with the small capitalist or the possessor of slowly accumulated savings, an investment in land is the exception rather than the rule? Is it not possible, that, where there is one conveyancing transaction under the existing law, there might be ten under a simpler, and cheaper, and more generally intelligible system? Is it an extravagant supposition that the social advantages described by Mr. Wakefield would result from the alteration of the law?—and even if it were clear that the lawyers would lose, instead of gaining, by such a change, could any honest and prudent adviser recommend them to insist upon their own selfish interest in opposition to the general good?

While, however, we concur in the resolution passed at Birmingham, that "the present system of transfer of land is, from the expense and delay inseparable from it, a great social evil," we are very far from regretting that the meeting did nothing more than add to their vote the safe general proposition, that the remedy for the declared evil "lies in the direction of registration." It will comfort our many friends who are, as we believe,

unnecessarily disquieted upon this subject, to observe, that the great Social Conference at Birmingham has not advanced, nor, indeed, was likely to advance, to the practical discussion of the carrying out of the desired reform. The plan has been declared, and we believe justly, to be a good plan; but the all-important question is—how can it be made to work? and no adequate answer to that question has been yet produced, nor do we see at present any very strong encouragement to expect one. The readers of papers were exceedingly successful in proving that something ought to be done, but their attempts to explain what that something ought to be are ill-considered and insufficient or mistaken. It is true that the Report of the Commission contains the sketch of a Bill which was probably intended to exhibit the plan of the Commissioners in a working shape, or rather, perhaps, as a first approximation to a more deliberate and accurately finished draft. Whatever was the author's purpose, his work is by no means perfect; and a Bill of Lord Brougham's, brought in towards the end of last session, is a far less satisfactory attempt than even that of the Commission to meet the difficulties of the task. It is true that we have now got Sir Fitzroy Kelly pledged to legislative activity; but if he perseveres in urging such a measure as he described at Birmingham, he can only be regarded as a fresh and eager candidate for a place upon the long list of ambitious, but unsuccessful, law reformers. There remains among the advocates of a cheap and speedy transfer of land the eminent name of Lord John Russell. We do not undervalue the importance of his accession to the cause; and, indeed, it was one of our leading purposes in this article to call the serious attention of our readers to this fact of grave significance. But the utmost that can be expected of the distinguished politician is, that when the Bill has been drawn and settled by astute and experienced lawyers, fully alive to the magnitude of their task, he will lend his influence in Parliament to the carrying of one more great reform. The difficulties of framing the measure are very considerable, but we are perfectly satisfied that they may be overcome. The triumph, however, does not seem likely to be a speedy one; and, for the sake of our provincial friends, we are perfectly well content that ample time should be allowed for the dissipation of prejudices and the quieting of alarms, which we confidently expect will yield at length to truth and reason.

CHANCERY JUDGES' CHAMBERS.

We this day publish the new regulations for the conduct of business at the Chancery Judges' Chambers, which have been adopted by the authority of the Master of the Rolls and the three Vice-Chancellors, and which, we presume, are to come into operation on Monday next. It is, perhaps, rather surprising that although these orders bear date as long ago as the 8th of August, their effect, and so far as we are aware, their existence also was unknown to the profession until the day before yesterday. It appears, however, that these regulations introduce no novelties of procedure. They are merely intended to embody the existing rules of practice, to adjust minute diversities of method which necessarily arose in the different chambers in the absence of a written code, and to inform solicitors exactly what rules they must observe, and what precautions they must take in order to economise their own and the official time. It is further to be observed that the regulations are neither long nor intricate; and such being their character and effect, it is not necessary to urge a complaint, which otherwise, would have been but too well founded, that the profession had neither been consulted in framing these regulations, nor informed of their existence in sufficient time to become masters of their scope and tenor.

Mr. Bloxam, the Chief Clerk to Vice-Chancellor Wood, has published an edition of these regulations and the accompanying forms, and has added an introduction and explanatory notes, which will probably be found useful. We quite concur in all that Mr. Bloxam takes the opportunity of urging as to the obligation resting upon practitioners to aid the judges and their clerks in expediting the course of business. It is well observed in this introduction, that "the time allowed for each case at chambers is upon the assumption that the parties will be prepared with all proper documents and information, and will be actuated by a desire to avoid waste of time." We believe that Mr. Bloxam's confidence in the earnest efforts of the profession to give the fairest possible trial to the new practice is well founded; and we hope it will appear that the issue of these regulations and forms, explained as they have been by so competent an authority as Mr. Bloxam, will do much to assist solicitors in conducting their business in the Judges' Chambers in the most expeditious and efficient manner.

But if Mr. Bloxam, or the Vice-Chancellor whom he represents, or any other officer or judge, is of opinion that any set of rules, however well-considered, worked by any practitioners, however diligent, could enable the business at chambers to be satisfactorily performed by the existing staff, we must be permitted to declare that we hold a totally opposite conviction. No doubt, under a good system, time and labour may be economised to a very considerable extent, but still the utmost result thus obtainable will fall very far short of enabling one man to do the work of two or three; and that, and nothing less, is requisite before the official and judicial staff of the Court of Chancery can become adequate to discharge its duties. We published on the 8th of August, the very day of the date of the regulations, the Report of the Equity Committee of the Incorporated Law Society on delays and defects complained of in several offices of the court. A copy of that document was sent to the Lord Chancellor, and his attention was promised to it. Whether anything has been or is intended to be done to remove the evils so forcibly described in the report we cannot say. But of this we are quite persuaded, that small improvements like the regulations now before us, however judicious and well-intentioned, are utterly inadequate to meet the necessities of the case. The business of the Court increases every year, and is now considerably larger than it was in 1852, when the new system began to operate. But previous to the changes of that year there were four judges, and ten masters, and ten chief clerks of masters, whereas now the number of judges remains the same, but the staff of inferior officers has been reduced from twenty masters and clerks to eight chief clerks of judges. Meantime, as we have said, the business of the Court increases, and would increase still more, but for the delays, which principally arise from that want of strength in chambers which has been so earnestly complained against by the solicitors. It results from these obstructions that the old unpopularity of the Court still clings to it; and even Lord John Russell, at the Birmingham Conferences, thought proper to quote Lord Erskine's hope that the Court he was addressing would not think of sending a fellow-creature into Chancery. Nay, more, it has actually been proposed that the administration of the estates of deceased insolvent traders should be given to the Court of Bankruptcy, and this in spite of the admitted unpopularity of that Court—an unpopularity so great that its officers are unemployed, and men of active minds wonder how they can possibly survive the endurance of so much leisure—and in spite, too, of an expense which has been lately estimated at 50 per cent. upon the amount administered in the Court.

We repeat, then, that it is essential to the efficiency of the Court of Chancery to appoint four additional judges,

so that each judge may be able to sit three days in the week in court, and three days in chambers to dispose of business which it was never intended to devolve and which ought not to be devolved upon the chief clerks. It is also absolutely necessary that the number of chief clerks should be augmented. On this proposal, if ever it advance far enough, we shall, of course, encounter the usual objections of the self-styled economists, and those who demand that the number of common law judges should be reduced, are very unlikely to allow that an augmentation could properly be made in Chancery. But we fear that the Government will very hardly be persuaded to attempt anything that can provoke the vigilance that lies in wait to cut off a judge's salary. One of the greatest experiments ever made to improve procedure will be frustrated by the indisposition to act, and by the fear of being charged with a desire to job and to create patronage. The hope which Mr. Bloxam expresses of seeing a new character given to the court, was once entertained by many earnest reformers who are now beginning to despond. The success of the new practice depends not only, as Mr. Bloxam says, upon the aid given by practitioners to the staff, but also, and much more immediately upon the efficiency of that staff itself. We can venture to guarantee the first of these requisites, but we almost despair of seeing adequate means taken to secure the second.

Legal News.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.—Oct. 28.

(Before Mr. Commissioner FOSBLANQUE.)

Groux's Improved Soap Company (Limited).

Mr. W. Flagell, broker, of Hudson's Bay House, Fenchurch-street, shareholder and contributor to the company, presented a petition for winding it up. The petition states, that, in March, 1853, an association was formed for the purpose of manufacturing soap, according to the method of one Louis Groux, and for other purposes mentioned in the deed of settlement, which bore date March 16, 1853, and was duly executed and registered according to the requirements of the Joint Stock Companies Act, 7 & 8 Vict. c. 110. The capital of the said company consisted of £50,000 in 50,000 shares of £1 each. The offices of the company were in the Minories, afterwards in King William-street. On June 25, 1856, the company was completely registered, and obtained a certificate of complete registration, with limited liability, under the Joint Stock Companies Act, 1856, under the title of "Groux's Improved Soap Company (Limited)." The petitioner is a holder of 500 shares. On September 14 last, the company in general meeting passed a special resolution, requiring the said company to be wound up by the court, which resolution was duly confirmed at a meeting on the 16th instant. The petitioner, therefore, prayed that the said company might be wound up.

A report of the directors, laid before the above meeting, attributes the difficulties of the company to the entire withdrawal of Mr. Groux, the manufacturing manager; the suspension by Mr. Henry Hayward, the company's agent, of his travellers and agents; a combination on the part of Mr. Groux, the company's late secretary, and Mr. H. Hayward, to ruin the company's trade, by diverting it to a private firm of their forming. A financial statement accompanying this report showed the debts and liabilities to be £13,000, with assets of about £9,500.

Mr. Laurance appeared in support of the petition; Mr. Doria for the directors; and Mr. Bagley for a portion of the shareholders.

The case was adjourned to a future day.

MANCHESTER BANKRUPTCY COURT.—Oct 19.

(Before Mr. Commissioner SKIRROW.)

Re John Potter.

This was an application to the court upon a petition presented to Mr. Whitmore Henry Parks, a creditor of the bankrupt, who is a portable weighing machine and scale beam maker, carrying on business at 56, Thomas-street, and 73, Great Ancoats-street, Manchester, an uncertificated bankrupt, praying that the Court would be pleased to order that its messenger should forthwith

seize and take possession of the bankrupt's effects then being upon his premises as above described.

The petition and affidavit in support thereof alleged that the fiat was dated so far back as June, 1846, and that the proceedings of the court had been rendered altogether nugatory, so far as the bankrupt's obedience to the law was concerned; for not only had he failed to surrender or attend any of its meetings, but had committed an act of felony, not only in having become outlawed, but had embezzled and concealed his property to a large amount; and that it was only lately it was discovered by the petitioner that he was carrying on his trade at two separate establishments, despite the facts above stated, and with all their consequences hanging over him. It was deposed to that his shops were well replenished with stock so recently as the 8th inst., although his creditors had only received from his assets, at the time of his bankruptcy, 1s. 11½d. in the pound; and that immediately upon these proceedings being instituted he closed his premises in Thomas-street, and had again secreted his stock.

Mr. Richardson, solicitor on behalf of the petitioner, applied that, upon these circumstances, the messenger of the court might be instructed to effect a seizure.

Mr. Commissioner SKIRROW said that the affidavit only went the length of saying that the petitioner had been informed and believed that property was seizable. It should have gone on to say who gave him that information.

Mr. Richardson—That surely could not be material; the question now being, whether the information was true.

Mr. Commissioner SKIRROW—Yes; and if you can give information of property, you will be entitled to your costs for bringing the same to light.

Mr. Richardson—I beg your Honour's pardon; I trust the consideration of costs is but of minor importance in a question of this nature. Here the Court has been set at defiance; and if you read the affidavit upon which the act of bankruptcy is founded, you will see that great fraud existed on the part of the bankrupt from the first.

Mr. Commissioner SKIRROW—That may be so; but where is Mr. Rowcroft, who, I see, is the trade assignee?

Mr. Richardson—He has, through his solicitors, Messrs. Chew & Sons, been duly served with notice of the present application, and also with a copy of the petition and an order of the Court to attend.

Mr. Commissioner SKIRROW—Let Mr. Chew be sent for.

Mr. Richardson—Mr. Chew has given an acceptance of service; surely that is sufficient. It is now on the verge of one, and twelve o'clock is the hour named.

Mr. Commissioner SKIRROW—I shall send for Mr. Chew.

The Messenger—It is a mile and a quarter from the court. The Commissioner then retired, and at half-past one Mr. Chew arrived.

The Commissioner, addressing Mr. Chew—There is a petition presented, stating that so far back as 1846 a fiat was issued against Potter, the bankrupt, who had failed to surrender and thereby committed felony; and that the bankrupt had had notice of the present application, which of all things was a most extraordinary course, and I am sure Mr. Simons (meaning the registrar) would not have directed it.

Mr. Richardson—I entirely exculpate Mr. Simons; it was your Honour who refused to act unless it was done, although at the time it was specially named that it would defeat the very object of the petition.

Mr. Commissioner SKIRROW—I am convinced the Court would not do anything so foolish.

Mr. Richardson—I again repeat that it was so, although your Honour has forgotten it.

Mr. Commissioner SKIRROW—Mr. Chew you will take care that every necessary inquiry shall be made, and if you find there is any property of the bankrupt, you will act. Tell Mr. Rowcroft I shall make no order, unless I see it is the property of the bankrupt. I shall make no order on this petition; I remember a similar case at Liverpool, and I aided in obtaining £2,500 for the creditors, and allowed the costs.

Mr. Richardson—I fear your Honour has not observed all the material parts of the affidavit and petition. The very place where he failed in 1846 is the same in which it is now alleged the property may be found; and it will clearly be of no avail unless immediate steps are taken.

Mr. Commissioner SKIRROW—I shall make no order on this petition; he may be indicted, for, as your petition very properly states, he has been guilty of felony.

Mr. Richardson—We want the property.

Mr. Commissioner SKIRROW—My officer might seize the pro-

perty not belonging to the bankrupt, and then might be liable to an action.

Mr. Richardson—But if we have shown ample reasons for making the seizure, your officer would be protected in acting under the warrant of the Court.

Mr. Commissioner SKIRROW—I shall make no order.

Mr. Richardson—Very well, it is unquestionably the last time I shall trouble your Honour with any similar application.

COUNTY COURT RETURNS, 1856.

We resume the interesting analysis of the late Parliamentary Returns respecting the County Courts:—

3.—Circuits on which the greatest and least number of Causes above £20 were entered.

Circuit.	Causes.	Circuit.	Causes.
6 Liverpool	308	25 Wolverhampton	165
30 Glamorganshire	305	10 Oldham	164
7 Salford	211	11 Bradford	161
14 Leeds	209	8 Manchester	160
2 Durham	205	26 Lichfield	158
12 Halifax	198	19 Derby	156
13 Sheffield	192	5 Bolton	149
52 Southampton	192	15 York	143
3 Carlisle	181	17 Lincoln	142
24 Monmouthshire	176	55 Bristol	81
51 Brighton	174	39 Colchester	70
4 Preston	170	40 Whitechapel	47

4.—Total number of Causes above £20.

1851	13,446	1854	9,395
1852	12,567	1855	8,604
1853	9,270	1856	7,877

The diminution of the number of these causes in 1853 was caused by the Common Law Procedure Act of 1852. The Summary Procedure on Bills of Exchange Act was passed in 1855.

5.—Causes entered above £20.

	Westminster.	Marylebone.	Clerkenwell.
1851	492	349	355
1852	376	269	251
1853	210	206	128
1854	240	202	135
1855	162	166	98
1856	121	123	91
	Manchester.	Liverpool.	Leeds.
1851	446	246	334
1852	552	398	303
1853	390	356	210
1854	358	337	236
1855	239	397	226
1856	160	308	209
	Glamorganshire.	Monmouthshire.	Bristol.
1851	233	279	133
1852	280	241	155
1853	171	154	87
1854	238	204	107
1855	242	164	101
1856	305	176	81
	Oxford, &c.	Cambridge, &c.	Brighton.
1851	247	221	317
1852	210	151	344
1853	173	92	293
1854	158	100	323
1855	151	79	251
1856	110	87	174

5.—Circuits on which Courts were held on the greatest and least number of Days or by Deputy.

Circuit.	Judge.	Days.	By Deputy.
30 Glamorganshire	Falconer	222	0
6 Liverpool	Pollock	199	14
53 Bath, &c.	Smith	196	4
24 Monmouthshire	Herbert	192	2
51 Brighton	Furner	191	21
1 Newcastle	Losh	186	0
4 Preston, &c.	Addison	182	29
13 Sheffield	Walker	181	3
50 Canterbury	Harwood	179	0
54 Gloucester	Fancillon	177	0
16 Hull	Raines	170	31
45 Westminster	Bayley	168	0
22 Coventry, &c.	Diuidale	165	2
59 Tavistock	Praed	161	4
37 Oxford	Parry	161	1

Circuit.	Judge.	Days.	By Deputy.
21 Birmingham	Trafford	160	1
23 Worcester	Parham	160	0
35 Cambridge	Collyer	157	21
15 York	Dowling	155	39
55 Bristol	Sir E. Wilmot	141	10
18 Nottingham	Wildman	99	0
40 Whitechapel	Manning	89	28
33 Ipswich	—	84	0

6.—Circuits showing the largest and least amount of Money for which Judgment was given in the Quarter from October 1 to December 31, 1856, with the amount of Fees and the Costs exclusive of the Fees of Court.

Circuit.	Amount.	Fees.	Costs exclusive of Fees of Court.
13 Sheffield	£8,455	£1,920	£1,356
14 Leeds	7,982	1,563	1,324
6 Liverpool	7,432	1,348	1,728
12 Halifax	7,341	1,478	1,188
41 Shoreditch	7,094	1,532	1,285
30 Glamorganshire	6,897	1,642	148
25 Wolverhampton	6,708	2,005	1,124
21 Birmingham	6,514	1,503	1,397
10 Oldham, &c.	6,350	1,437	1,085
5 Bolton, &c.	6,239	1,245	884
8 Manchester	5,731	1,378	925
48 Lambeth	5,675	1,219	949
9 Stockport, &c.	5,623	1,428	697
47 Southwark	5,383	1,095	928
12 Halifax, &c.	5,207	1,287	930
19 Derby, &c.	5,120	1,364	973
44 Marylebone	4,942	1,272	880
7 Salford, &c.	4,895	1,148	919
4 Preston, &c.	4,865	996	774
43 Bloomsbury	4,503	1,002	707
45 Westminster	4,424	1,201	172
31 Carnarthen, &c.	1,337	387	162
39 Colchester, &c.	1,403	330	298
40 Whitechapel	3,599	844	42
55 Bristol	3,461	805	108

On the two last-named circuits, and also on circuit 30, the amount of the costs was the smallest.

On some circuits the judge has to travel from 200 to 300 miles monthly.

Mr. Blundell, the Assistant Messenger to the London Court of Bankruptcy, has been appointed by the Lord Chancellor Messenger to the Court at Liverpool.

Mr. J. B. Aspinall has been appointed Deputy-Recorder of Liverpool, vice Mr. Blair, who has accepted the judgeship of the County Court.—*Liverpool Albion*.

The law secretary to the Runcorn Commissioners, Mr. Edwin Shaw, has been committed to gaol for two months, for default on the extent of 204*l.* 7*s.* 10*d.*—*Liverpool Albion*.

We are happy to announce that Edwin Lovell, Esq., has been appointed by the Judge of the County Courts of Somerset to succeed his late brother as Registrar of the Wells County Court.—*Bristol Mirror*.

The Duke of Northumberland having, through the Chairman of Quarter Sessions (C. W. Orde, Esq.), invited the Bar of the Northern Circuit to visit Alnwick Castle, business was suspended for an hour on Thursday, and counsel accepted his Grace's invitation.—*Gateshead Observer*.

Messrs. Slade and Vining, extensive solicitors, of Yeovil, have filed a petition of bankruptcy in the Exeter Bankruptcy Court this week. Their liabilities are said to amount to £80,000. The assets are large. The creditors of the separate estates will, it is said, receive 20*s.* in the pound; and the joint creditors will have a good dividend.—*Bristol Mirror*.

At the West Riding Sessions, held at Knaresborough, on Monday, the 19th, the actual criminal business before the court consisted of one prisoner, who pleaded guilty of stealing a shirt, value 2*s.* The plea of the prisoner rendered the criminal business nearly nil, and yet there were in attendance on the court eight magistrates, who had travelled an average of twelve miles; forty jurymen, who had travelled an average of twelve miles; ten barristers—eight from London—and twelve officials of the court, who had travelled on an average twenty miles each.—*Leeds Mercury*.

The French Tribunals.

A very important question, and especially interesting to all foreigners engaged in stock transactions on the Paris Bourse, was raised before the Tribunal of Commerce on Thursday last. The facts were these:—A wealthy Italian gentleman, named Di Nuovo, some time ago went to Monsieur Gannerou, a stock-broker, and announced his intention of carrying on operations on the Bourse. He at the same time deposited 100,000 francs as security for the payment of his differences. The lodgment of so large a sum, combined with the fact that he first confined his operations to mere "continuations" (*reports*), which are perfectly safe, caused Monsieur Gannerou to feel the greatest confidence in him. After a while, however, he contrived to get his deposit out of Gannerou, and entered into speculations which resulted in a loss of 49,752 francs. This sum Di Nuovo declined to pay, and Gannerou brought an action against him before the Tribunal of Commerce to compel him to reimburse it. The defendant opposed the action on two grounds—first, want of jurisdiction in the Court; and, secondly, that, as it was a gambling operation, the law could not recognise it. The Tribunal, however, decided that it had jurisdiction; and "as the relations between the parties authorised Gannerou to have confidence in the defendant, especially after the deposit he had made," it condemned him to pay the sum claimed, with interest and costs.

The Civil Tribunal of Paris has just given a decision of great interest to all railway travellers. The question raised was, whether railway companies are liable for luggage not registered. The facts were:—A gentleman named Laroche arrived on the evening of the 13th of September last at the station of the Orleans Railway. As he had to wait an hour for the train by which he wanted to proceed on his journey, one of the porters of the company took his portmanteau, and told him that he would find it in the luggage-room on the starting of the train. At the appointed time, however, the portmanteau was not forthcoming, and all attempts to discover it proved fruitless. Monsieur Laroche sued the company for 500 francs as indemnity for the loss. The company disputed its liability, on the ground that it was only responsible for luggage actually registered. The Tribunal, however, decided that they were liable, and condemned the company to pay the plaintiff 300 francs, with the costs of the action.

A point of some interest to incarcerated debtors in France was raised before the Civil Tribunal last Wednesday. A person named Baron was, in January last, transferred, after confinement in several prisons, to the debtors' prison in the Rue de Clichy. He was there detained by several creditors who deposited their respective portions of one franc per diem, which the law requires for the maintenance of an imprisoned debtor. Subsequently, one of these creditors, without communicating with the others, gave the man a discharge, and withdrew the portion of the one franc a day which he had hitherto paid for his maintenance. Baron immediately demanded his release from the director of the prison, as the sum of one franc had not been made up as required by the law. The director of the prison refused, and Baron appealed to the Civil Tribunal. The court decided, that, as notwithstanding the withdrawal of one of the creditors, the money deposited by the others was sufficient to maintain the prisoner for 150 days, he was not entitled to his discharge. The appeal was therefore rejected with costs.

A very singular question as to the liability of railways in the carriage of goods of value was raised on Monday last before the Tribunal of Commerce. The case was this:—A sum of 15,000 francs in gold was sent last December from Langres, Côte-d'Or, by the Messageries Générales, to a Monsieur Laurent, residing in Paris. The sum not having reached him, he instituted an action against the Messageries Company, and recovered the amount. The company in their turn sued the Lyons Railway Company, to whom the hamper had been entrusted from which the gold had been stolen. The Tribunal reserved its judgment until the prosecution of the man who stole the money should have been concluded. On the trial, which ended in the condemnation of the thief, it was shown that he was in the service of the Messageries, and that he had abstracted the gold before the hamper was confided to the Lyons Railway Company. Notwithstanding these facts the Messageries Company proceeded with their action against the Lyons Railway, on the grounds, that, as the company had accepted the hamper on the declaration that its contents were worth 15,000 francs, without exami-

nation, it was responsible. The defendants maintained that they could not be made responsible for a robbery which had not been committed on their line, on their premises, or by their servants. The Tribunal adopted this view of the case, and dismissed the action with costs.

Legislation of the Year.

20 & 21 VICTORIE, 1857.—(Continued.)

CAP. LV.—An Act to promote the Establishment and Extension of Reformatory Schools in England.

The part maintenance by the State of juvenile offenders at reformatory schools only dates from the year 1854, though before that time schools under the same name, for the better training of such offenders, had been established by voluntary contribution in various parts of Great Britain. By 17 & 18 Vict. c. 86, however, the directors or managers of any institution of the kind were enabled (after an inspection of the school by a Government-inspector resulting in a satisfactory report of its condition and regulations), to cause such institution to be certified as a reformatory school under that Act; and thereupon to obtain from the Treasury either the whole cost of the care and maintenance of any offender detained therein, or such portion of such cost as should not be recovered from its parents or step-parents under certain other of the provisions of the Act. This same statute contained clauses for supplying such institutions with pupils; for it enabled any court, judge, metropolitan police or stipendiary magistrate, or two or more justices, before whom any person under the age of sixteen years should be convicted of any offence (either on indictment or by way of summary conviction), to direct that such offender, in addition to the sentence passed as a punishment for the offence (provided such sentence was imprisonment for fourteen days at the least), should be sent, at the expiration of his sentence, to any certified reformatory school whereof the directors or managers might be willing to receive him, there to be detained (unless the Home Secretary should in the meantime order his discharge) for any period between two and five years.

In the succeeding session, the provisions contained in the above Act for enforcing contribution by the parents or step-parents to the support and maintenance of offenders so detained in any such institution were, by 18 & 19 Vict. c. 87, modified in some of their details, though the principle of requiring such contribution to the extent of five shillings per week (if the parent or step-parent be of sufficient ability) was retained; and by 19 & 20 Vict. c. 109, further improvements were ingrafted on the system: 1. By allowing the particular school to be changed by a supplemental order of detention, at any time during the period of imprisonment imposed by the sentence; 2. By permitting the parent, guardian, or nearest surviving relative of the offender to select, under certain conditions, the certified school to which the offender shall be detained, or to which he shall be removed; 3. By throwing upon the county, city, or borough in which the sentence is passed the expense of conveying him to the school in which he is to be detained (unless in the case of an additional expense caused by such selection of another school by the parent or guardians as above mentioned, in which case such additional expense is thrown on the party applying); 4. By imposing a pecuniary penalty, and, in default, imprisonment to the extent of sixty days, on any person wilfully withdrawing, or inducing to abscond, offenders ordered to be detained; and 5. By causing a list of all such institutions, duly certified, to be from time to time published in the *Gazette*.

The system, of which the above is a general account, has been still further extended and improved by the Act under discussion. The clauses as to enforcing from the parent or step-parent a weekly contribution of any reasonable sum not exceeding five shillings, are again (by ss. 8—12) remodelled; so that the sum ordered to be contributed shall vary, if needs be, with the ability of the parent or step-parent, during the period of detention. The most important provisions, however, of this Act are those which refer to the way in which these institutions may be established and supported; to the religious instruction of the pupils; and for the due care and protection of them after their discharge. As to the first object, it is now (s. 1) made lawful for any county justices in sessions, or any borough council with separate sessions, to accede to an application (made after two months notice) for an order for the payment of money in aid of any certified reformatory school already, or intended to be, established—such money to be appli-

cable, either towards the purchase of a site, or the expenses of building, fitting-up, enlarging, or altering, as the case may require. As to the second object, the Act under discussion provides, that, on representation made by the parent or guardian, or nearest adult relative (as the case may require), any offender so detained may, at certain hours of the day, fixed by the managers or directors, be visited by a minister of the religious persuasion of the offender, for the purpose of affording him religious assistance, and instructing him in the principles of his religion. The third object above indicated (the importance of which to the usefulness of the whole system can scarcely be exaggerated) is aimed at by the 13th section. This makes it lawful "for the managers of any reformatory school, previous to making application for discharge of any juvenile offender," to place him on trial (provided half of his term of detention shall have expired) with some person "to be named in the licence hereinafter" [mentioned?] "most willing to receive and take charge of him," and to grant to the offender a licence to reside with such person for any term not exceeding thirty days, unless sooner summoned to return to the school; and it is further enacted that "such managers shall bring back such offender to the said school, provided that such offender shall not have been previously discharged from the school, by order of the Secretary of State." This section is introduced by a recital, that "it is expedient to make further provision for the due care and protection of juvenile offenders discharged from reformatory schools; but we confess we do not think the enacting part of the section carries out the announced intention. We do not, however, profess wholly to understand it. We are not aware of any provision in the previous Acts for the discharge of the offender, after application for that purpose by the managers. At the expiration of the period for which he is ordered to be detained, the offender is, of course, entitled to his discharge without application from anybody; if it be desired to obtain his discharge before the end of such period, then, it is true, an application must be made for a Secretary of State's order, under 17 & 18 Vict. c. 86, s. 4, recognised and confirmed by 19 & 20 Vict. c. 109, s. 5; but such application would not be made by the managers, but by the friends of the offender. We are inclined to think that the words "previous to making application for the discharge of any juvenile offender committed to such school," should be struck out altogether. Without them, the provision is quite intelligible (except that we demur to the expression "some person most willing to receive," &c.—why most willing?), though we do not think it a satisfactory one. Supposing such a licence to be granted upon the expiration of half of a five years' sentence of detention, there is no provision for its being renewed; and, therefore, the child would not, as it seems to us, be much the better for it at the time of his ultimate discharge.

CAP. LVIII.—An Act to enable Married Women to dispose of Reversionary Interests in Personal Estates.

Upon the abolition of fines and recoveries, in the year 1833, by the 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 74, careful provisions were inserted in that Act for the substitution of a fresh method, by which a married woman could, with her husband's concurrence, dispose of her interest in any estate in lands. This object was attained by enacting that a married woman should, from the passing of that Act, be as competent as if she were a feme sole, to dispose, by deed, of lands or of money subject to be invested in the purchase of lands, and also to extinguish any estate, &c., provided only that her husband should concur in the deed; and provided that, upon her executing the same or afterwards, she produced and acknowledged such deed before the proper authorities—a certificate of such acknowledgment being directed by the Act to be filed of record in the Court of Common Pleas.

Lands at the disposal of a married woman being provided for by this statute, and such personal estate as comes to her during the coverture belonging, as it does, to her husband by the general rules of law regulating the relationship of husband and wife, and being disposable by him without her concurrence, there remains only to be considered such future or reversionary interest (whether vested or contingent) in, or power with regard to, any personal estate to which a married woman, or her husband in her right, is entitled under any instrument. And no way in which such interest might be disposed of, or such power released or extinguished, existed until the Act under discussion. The object, therefore, of this Act is to extend the capacity to dispose, and the manner of disposal, given by the Fines and Recoveries Act, with respect to land, to such future or reversionary interest, as above mentioned, in personal estate, as comes to the wife, or husband in her right, under in-

struments made after Dec. 31, 1857; and it does so by enacting, as in the former statute, that a married woman may by deed dispose of such interest, or release or extinguish such power, provided that her husband concur in the deed; that she acknowledge the deed in the same manner prescribed by the former statute with respect to lands; and that the instrument under which she is entitled does not restrain her from alienation. Another enactment in the Act under discussion is, that, subject to the provisions just mentioned, she may also release and extinguish her right or equity to a settlement out of any personal estate to which she, or her husband in her right, may be entitled in possession under any instrument made after Dec. 31, 1857, other than her marriage settlement. This, it is apprehended, has reference to the jurisdiction which the courts of equity exercise of compelling, in general, a settlement for the wife out of any equitable property coming to her, recovered during the coverture by the husband, through the medium of the court.

A singular omission seems to have been made in the Act under discussion. By s. 2, deeds executed by married women under its provisions are to be acknowledged in the manner prescribed by the Fines and Recoveries Act, with respect to lands. The persons before whom such deeds are to be acknowledged (not to speak of the Masters in Chancery, as to whom see 15 & 16 Vict. c. 80) are the judges of the superior courts, or two commissioners appointed for the purpose. But by 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, s. 73, power was conferred on the judges of the county courts, also, to receive such acknowledgments—an enactment of the existence of which the framers of the Act under discussion was probably ignorant, as no allusion to it whatever appears, and there can be no reason why the county court judges should not receive acknowledgments in the one case just as well as in the other.

CAP. LXII.—An Act for the Alteration and Amendment of the Laws and Duties of Customs.

The only sections of this Act which it seems necessary to notice, are

1. *Sec. 15.*—By this section it is expressly declared (in order to clear up doubts which had arisen on the subject), that the whole of the Customs Consolidation Act, 1853 (16 & 17 Vict. c. 107), and of the Supplemental Customs Consolidation Act, 1855 (18 & 19 Vict. c. 96), apply to the *British possessions abroad*, as well as to the United Kingdom and Channel Islands—except where otherwise in those Acts expressly provided; and except as to such of those possessions as have, with the sanction of the Crown, by any local Act or ordinance, entirely provided for their own customs, trade, and navigation.

2. *Sec. 16.*—By this section, an owner or consignee importing any bullion or coin (except small parcels imported as passengers' luggage) must deliver to the collector, or other customs' officer, a full and true account thereof, under the penalty of £20.

3. *Sec. 17.*—This section declares, that so much of 16 & 17 Vict. c. 107, as repeals 8 & 9 Vict. c. 90, ss. 9, 10, 11, and 12, shall be repealed. These restored provisions refer to commercial treaties with foreign powers, and as to the duties imposed on their vessels or produce, or on the goods imported by them.

4. *Sec. 18.*—By this section, 18 & 19 Vict. c. 96, s. 19, as to importing and exporting spirits into or from the Channel Islands, in boats and casks of a specified size, is repealed.

5. *Sec. 20.*—The term "British built ship," is declared to mean and include any ship built in her Majesty's dominions.

Recent Decisions in Chancery.

IMPLIED REPEAL OF A STATUTE BY A SUBSEQUENT "CONTRARIANT" STATUTE.

O'Flaherty v. M'Dowell, 6 H. L. C. 142.

In this case it was held that an Irish statute was repealed, as to its operation on Irish joint-stock banks, by a subsequent imperial statute, although the later contained no reference to the earlier statute. The ground of the decision was, that the provisions contained in the former Act were wholly irreconcilable with the rights given to creditors of a bank by the latter. The Lord Chancellor observed on this point, "I do not dispute the general proposition, that an affirmative statute giving a new right does not of itself and of necessity destroy a previously existing right; but it has that effect if the apparent intention of the Legislature is, that the two rights should not co-exist together." Lords *Brougham*, *St. Leonards*, and *Wensleydale* concurred in this view. The main contention in the case was,

whether the provisions of the Irish statute were, in fact, entirely incompatible with subsequent legislation. In the course of the argument, Lord *Clare's* dictum in *Hayden v. Carroll* (3 Ridgw. Parl. Cas. 545) was very much discussed. His Lordship, in that case, was of opinion that a subsequent affirmative statute might repeal a prior one if the words were "contrariant;" but that, if there were two affirmative statutes made on the same subject, on all points on which they did not contradict each other both should stand, and might form two distinct codes. The Lord Chancellor considered that this general proposition could not be doubted; but Lord *Brougham*, in delivering judgment, observed, that, though the provisions of the subsequent statute might not be in direct positive contradiction, or be "contrariant" to the prior statute, they might be so entirely inconsistent with it, that they might operate as effectually against the subsistence of the prior statute—a proposition which appears to be debatable in the degree in which it may be understood as differing from the rule laid down by Lord *Clare*.

DISCOVERY—COMPULSORY REFERENCE TO ARBITRATION— PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS.

The British Empire Steam Shipping Co. v. Somes, 5 W. R. 813.

The judgment in this case is in one sense an extension, in another something like a restriction, of the received doctrine as to discovery in equity. The dispute arose out of proceedings at law, taken to recover the cost of repairing a ship. The action resulted in an order for compulsory arbitration, under the provisions of the Common Law Procedure Act. The bill was filed by the defendants at law for discovery in aid of the action, or rather of the arbitration, which had resulted from it. To this bill a demurrer was put in, on the ground that discovery will not be given in aid of the proceedings before the private forum of arbitrators—a doctrine established by the case of *Street v. Rigby* (6 Ves. 821), where Lord *Eldon* laid it down, that the Court of Chancery would not exert its power of compelling discovery in aid of a domestic forum. On this point, the Court decided on the obvious principle that an arbitration enforced under the provisions of a statute by a regular tribunal was not, in any sense, a domestic forum, and that the maxim of *Street v. Rigby* had no application to such a case. The defendants thereupon put in their answer, but declined to furnish documents showing what they themselves had expended on the materials and labour consumed in the repairs. It is not an uncommon thing for a discovery somewhat analogous to this to be granted; of which we may mention, as an example, a case of the *London Assurance v. Martinez* (which, we believe, is not reported), where the plaintiffs in equity, who were sued at law on a policy of insurance of some pictures which had been destroyed by fire, extracted from the defendant all the particulars of the money and goods which he had given in exchange for the pictures, so as to obtain evidence in opposition to that which the insurer produced in the court of law as to the actual value of the goods insured. Discovery of this kind is obtained as a matter of course; and it seems a fine distinction to say, that you may force a man to betray the real value of his goods by discovering the price he gave for them, but that you cannot compel him to make known the value of the work he has done, by disclosing the cost of the materials and labour employed upon it. The Vice-Chancellor, while allowing the discovery generally, nevertheless gave leave to the defendants in equity to seal up so much of their books as tended to expose the calculations on which their business was conducted. The judgment shows some leaning towards the common law notion of discovery under the new Acts, which practically excludes everything which is not well known and capable of being pointed out before the application is made; and it may have been an element in the decision, that the Court of Queen's Bench had already refused a similar application for discovery in this very case. The judgment of V. C. *Wood*, however, does not go far in this direction; and it would be a great mistake to treat it as an authority for emasculating the practice as to discovery, which, however little it may be appreciated on the other side of Westminster-hall, is one of the most valuable heads of Chancery jurisdiction.

CONSTRUCTION—MONEY—THE TERMS OF AN EXCEPTING CLAUSE NOT ALLOWED TO EXTEND THE FORCE OF WORDS USED IN THE ORIGINAL GIFT.

Ludlow v. Stevenson, 5 W. R. 828.

Decisions as to what is or what is not comprised in the term "money" are common enough, and for the most part turn on the context of the will in which the phrase occurs. The present case, however, involves a principle laid down by V. C. *Wood*, and adopted on appeal by the Lord Chancellor. The bequest

was, of all the testator's "books, plate, linen, china, wearing apparel, watches, jewels, and money (except money at testator's bankers or in the funds, or placed on security), and all other property not otherwise disposed of;" and, subject to this gift, the residue was devoted to certain purposes, the ultimate gift being to certain societies. The contention for the specific legatee was, that money, in the sense in which the testator used the term, was something large enough to include money in the funds or placed on security, as was shown by the language of the exception. Now, the testator happened to possess property *ejusdem generis* with money in the funds, and which yet did not fall within the words of the exception. This property consisted of foreign stock, and shares in foreign companies; and if the word money could only be interpreted by analogy to the exception, these particulars would have fallen within the general gift of "money and other property," and would not have been taken out of it by the express language of the exception. In opposition to this ingenious argument, the Court, both below and on appeal, held that the primary sense of words used in the gift could not be extended by any inference drawn from the language of the exception—the province of which was to limit, and not to enlarge the bequest. The decision, though resting on this view, is not wholly dependent on it; for there were indications in the other parts of the will that the testator considered that he had "otherwise disposed of" that portion of his property which was invested in any shape so as to bear income. The case may nevertheless be valuable, as indicating a position which may admit of many applications—viz. that the language of an excepting clause cannot fairly be appealed to to enlarge by inference the interpretation of the corresponding words in the general gift.

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—EFFECT OF A DEVISE OR BEQUEST IN TRUST FOR A. FOR LIFE WITHOUT POWER OF ANTICIPATION, FOLLOWED BY A GIFT TO THE HEIRS, EXECUTORS, ADMINIS- TRATORS, AND ASSIGNS OF A.

Quisted v. Michell, 5 W. R. 834.

Questions often arise whether gifts substantially amounting to devises or bequests of the entire ownership do or do not pass the absolute property. It has been held, for example, in *Ross v. Ross* (1 J. & W. 154) that a gift to A., with a gift over of so much as A. shall not have disposed of in his lifetime, passes the entire interest, as it involves an absolute control over the whole; but see on this point *Surman v. Surman* (5 Madd. 123), and *Cowman v. Harrison* (1 W. R. 96). In the present case, the form of the will was somewhat different. The first gift was in trust for A. for life, but not by way of anticipation, with a gift over to the heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns of A. Relying apparently, in some measure, on the restraint upon anticipation, V. C. *Kinderley* held, that, with respect both to the real and personal estate, the true construction was, that he will created an estate for life, with an absolute power of appointment by deed.

Professional Intelligence.

CANDIDATES FOR EXAMINATION.

Persons applying to be admitted attorneys are required to attend on Tuesday, November 17, at half-past nine in the forenoon, at the Hall of the Incorporated Law Society, in Chancery-lane, in order to be examined. The examination will commence at ten o'clock precisely.

The articles of clerkship and assignment, if any, with answers to the questions as to due service, according to the regulations approved by the judges, must be left with the Secretary, on or before Monday, November 9.

Where the articles have not expired, but will expire during the term, the candidate may be examined conditionally; but the articles must be left within the first seven days of term, and answers up to that time. If part of the term has been served with a barrister, special pleader, or London agent, answers to the questions must be obtained from them, as to the time served with each respectively.

A paper will be delivered to each candidate, containing questions to be answered in writing, classed under the several heads of—1. Preliminary; 2. Common and Statute Law, and Practice of the Courts; 3. Conveyancing; 4. Equity, and Practice of the Courts; 5. Bankruptcy, and Practice of the Courts; 6. Criminal Law, and Proceedings before Justices of the Peace.

Each candidate is required to answer all the preliminary questions (No. 1); and also to answer in three of the other heads of inquiry—viz. Common Law, Conveyancing, and Equity.

The Examiners will continue the practice of proposing questions in "Bankruptcy," and in "Criminal Law," and "Proceedings before Justices of the Peace," in order that candidates who have given their attention to these subjects may have the advantage of answering such questions, and having the correctness of their answers in those departments taken into consideration in summing up the merit of their general examination.

Under the new rules of Hilary Term, 1853, it is provided that every person who shall have given notices of examination and admission, and "who shall not have attended to be examined, or not have passed the examination, or not have been admitted, may, within one week after the end of the term for which such notices were given, renew the notices for examination or admission for the then next ensuing term, and so from time to time as he shall think proper;" but shall not be admitted until the last day of the term, unless otherwise ordered.

In case testimonials were deposited in a former term, they should be re-entered, and the answers completed to the present time.

Correspondence.

DUBLIN.—(From our own Correspondent.)

LEGAL EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

While the subject of legal education attracts so much attention, and gives rise to so much discussion at the meetings of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association and elsewhere, it can hardly be deemed inappropriate to give some account of the present state of legal education in Ireland.

Reversing the usual order of things, and inquiring, in the first instance, as to the means of improvement here furnished to students who desire to be inscribed on the roll of attorneys and solicitors, we do not find much that redounds to the credit of the governing bodies who take on themselves to regulate the admission to this branch of the profession. Without entering into any historical disquisition into the origin of the jurisdiction exercised by the benchers of the King's Inns over attorneys and solicitors, it will suffice to remark, that this jurisdiction is still maintained to such a degree that no attorney can even take an apprentice (or articulated clerk as he would be called in England) without the permission of the benchers. Complaints have from time to time been made against what is alleged to be an encroachment on the rights of the more numerous branch of the profession, and it has been forcibly urged, that if the attorneys are to continue subject to this authority, and are to contribute, as they have always done, to the revenues of the King's Inns, they ought at least to have representatives of their own order among the benchers, and some voice in the management of this important institution. No such concession has, however, been made; and to this day no attorney or solicitor is ever selected by the benchers to fill any vacancy that may occur in their number. The property and funds, which it is asserted by the attorneys are held in trust for both branches of the profession, are under the exclusive control of one branch; and although those funds are devoted to otherwise unexceptional objects, it may safely be asserted that no provision whatever is made by them for the professional education of any but students for the bar. The only benefits derived by the attorneys from their connection with the King's Inns are the following:—They have admission to the large and excellent library of that institution, and they are, equally with the bar, entitled to dine daily, in term time, in the noble Common Hall, one-half of which is appropriated for their use. Their apprentices, however, have no such privileges. The use of the library might, one would think, be allowed to them with great propriety; for, although situated in an inconvenient quarter of the town, it contains an admirable collection of law and general literature; and access to it would be prized by many a clerk who has, at present, no means of learning anything of the law beyond its merest mechanism. The law lectures instituted by the benchers, and delivered by very competent professors four times a week, are, indeed, open to the public, and apprentices may, if they choose, attend them. This privilege is not, however, here or elsewhere, very highly valued; and we never remember to have seen an apprentice in the lecture room. Is there not, in our time, a very general dislike to volunteering into lecture rooms? and are not the best lectures of the best lecturers neglected by all whose attendance is not compulsory, or in some manner requisite to qualify for something? The apprentices know well that these lectures are

not intended for their benefit; and they will never attend them until such time as a certificate of attendance shall be made a *sine quâ non* for admission to the roll.

It will probably astonish many English solicitors to be informed that the apprentice (or articulated clerk), after serving for five years, complying with the rules, and making the required payments, can obtain his admission without any examination or other test of fitness. It seems probable, that in old times candidates for admission were examined; for even now there are certain officials who are nominated by the judges, and who are entitled to a fee of a guinea from each new attorney. The office is now, and has long been, a complete sinecure; and not a question is ever answered by, or asked of, the applicant beyond the demand of the accustomed fee. This being the case, it is not surprising that study of the law in Ireland usually follows, instead of preceding, admission to its practice. The attorney, after he has been sworn in, finds it necessary to know something as to how and when writs should be issued, petitions filed, deeds prepared, or judgments registered. His want of knowledge on these and such like subjects leads to daily conferences with his counsel; and the amount of assistance gratuitously afforded by the bar in this way would surprise London practitioners, with whom every "consultation" is a matter of solemnity, and involves an *honorarium*. Even with these aids, and with the aids often furnished by a quick perception and a ready mind, the first clients of the new attorney are frequently of the use to him that the patients in an hospital-walk are to the medical student. By their instrumentality he is first seriously taught his profession, and the experience thus gained forms the chief part of his education. It is true that the profession, with all these drawbacks, is not behindhand when compared with many others, and numbers many practitioners of singular ability and acuteness; but we believe that even the best of them have profited very little by any education but that afforded in early practice, superadded to those qualities which enable some gifted individuals to "pick up" knowledge with scarcely any effort, and with no actual study. Rules ought, however, to be framed, and systems constructed, otherwise than with a view to exceptional cases. It has long been the practice in England to require a large amount of legal knowledge, tested by a strict examination before admission to practise; and there can be no good reason why a different system should prevail here.

The sinecure office we have described, perhaps, could not now be rendered useful or effective; but there is an Incorporated Law Society, to whom the examination of apprentices might be intrusted, as in England. The council of that Society comprises the foremost members of the profession; it is well managed, and has all the advantages of spacious buildings within the inclosure of the Four Courts. All that it wants is increased powers, and a well-devised scheme of law lectures and examinations.

Education for the bar so nearly resembles what it is in England, that no detailed sketch of it is required. Four law lectureships exist in Dublin—two at the King's Inns, and two in Trinity College—and the lecturers are all men of high attainments. Attendance on several courses of *any* two lecturers is compulsory; the number of lectures to be attended, as well as of terms to be kept, being considerably lower in the case of graduates of an university. There is no examination whatever; and Irish students who are ambitious of distinction are under the necessity of studying and submitting themselves for examination at the Inns of court in London, where their success in obtaining honours has been very remarkable. Advantage is generally taken of the time required for keeping terms in London, for reading in chambers there; and this is the more desirable, as few counsel at the Irish bar take pupils, or could (if in any practice) attend to their court business, and also read with pupils. There are not, at the Irish bar, any practitioners who confine themselves to pleading or conveyancing; and, no doubt, it is for such reasons as these, and from a general idea that the present system tends to assimilate the law in the United Kingdom, that the benchers of the King's Inns have resolutely refused to diminish the terms required to be kept in London by all candidates for the Irish bar.

EDINBURGH.—(From our own Correspondent.)

We took occasion last week to give a brief sketch of the regulations adopted by the Society of Writers to the Signet in 1851, in regard to the applicants for indenture. In order to complete the communication, we propose to notice here, in an equally brief manner, the regulations applicable to apprentices

during the term of their apprenticeship: premising that these regulations have been in operation since 1844, and have given general satisfaction—

1. The apprentice is bound to serve for five years, and is prohibited from doing any business on his own account during that period.

2. He must, during the course of his apprenticeship, attend four courses of the law classes—viz. one of civil law, one of Scots law, one of conveyancing, and a second course of any of these he may choose.

3. At the expiration of the term of apprenticeship, he must procure and record at the Signet Office a discharge by his master.

4. He may then, upon petition, stand his private examination.

5. If he passes his private trials, he may then stand his public examination.

Each branch of law mentioned under the second head is taught from separate chairs in the university, and by separate professors. The session lasts for about five months each year, and the professor during that period devotes an hour each day to his class, either in lecturing or examination.

The private examinations, which take place at the expiry of the term of apprenticeship, are conducted by three members of the society, annually chosen. Each examiner makes a separate examination, after which they meet and make their report. The examination is strictly legal; and each examination may embrace the whole subject of Scotch law: but in practice, the examiners generally arrange to divide the subject; as, for example, one examines upon conveyancing, another upon mercantile law, another upon the forms of process. The public examination takes place in the hall of the society, before eight or ten members of the body, also annually chosen, who test the candidate's legal qualifications in any way they think fit; and the examination never degenerates into a mere form. It may appear strange, perhaps, to English solicitors that so much is required of Scotch solicitors; but it ought to be explained that they are the conveyancers of the country, and that, to a certain extent, they draw pleadings. The summons, which contains the pursuer's statement of his case, and the legal deductions meant to be maintained, and which is the foundation of the whole process, being, as a rule, always drawn by the solicitor.

The fees paid on entering into indenture amount to about £400: Of this, £60 goes for the stamp, £150 to the master, £50 to a widow's fund, and the other £140 to the library. On entering the body, about £150 more is paid: of which, £25 goes for the stamp for the commission, the rest for fees and society purposes, which need not be particularly specified.

As the long vacation is still running here, there is little legal news to communicate. The first division of the court, before rising in July, had, under a late statute, resolved to sit on the 1st of November for the despatch of business, being eleven days earlier than the ordinary statutory period; but the subsequent Act of last session has deranged all these plans, having enacted that the court of session shall meet on the 12th of November. The first division will not, therefore, meet till the rest of the court assembles, or if it does it will only be for the purpose of adjourning.

The remonstrances addressed to the Commissioners of Customs from Leith in reference to the smuggling case there, mentioned in a late number, have produced an order from the Commissioners for the release of all the men convicted, with the exception of one named Dixon, against whom the Commissioners profess to see stronger evidence than against the others. But it is to be hoped that the matter will not be allowed to end here. It seems monstrous that any form of law should exist under which a host of persons within a certain distance of the place where a crime has been committed, but not one of whom has been legally convicted of committing that crime, can be sent to prison to give the Commissioners of Customs an opportunity of exercising their discrimination in selecting the most likely criminal, which is truly the result to which the present case has been brought.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS BY MARRIED WOMEN.

To the Editor of THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL & REPORTER.

SIR,—Assist me with your views, or oblige me by publishing the views of others, if this letter provoke any replies, upon the following point connected with acknowledgments of deeds by married women:—

Is there any additional fee beyond the 18s. 4d. to the Commissioner who makes the affidavit of due acknowledgment? It is often demanded (6s. 8d.), and generally paid, on the ground that

making the affidavit involves often as much trouble as taking the acknowledgment, because the affidavit has to be carefully read over, and afterwards an attendance to be sworn perhaps at two or three places to find a Commissioner in C. P. within, and not unfrequently the affidavit comes back to be re-sworn in consequence of some trifling error; but I find no fee allowed for it in the Rules and Orders, and I think none is legally payable; and the Commissioner is only doing that which the attorney ought to do, and for the attorney's accommodation, and for which he is entitled to charge to his client the fee of 6s. 8d. for attending to be sworn to affidavit; and if he like to pay this fee to the Commissioner, and the Commissioner is willing to receive it, well and good. But I am strongly impressed with the idea that no such fee is demandable; and until it is an understood rule throughout the profession that it ought to be taken by the Commissioner, I purpose refusing to receive it, because it comes out of the pocket of the attorney (he cannot charge it to his client), and the idea of professional courtesy or kind feeling in the profession is done away with if the Commissioner accepts it. Might not the attorneys in each large town, through the agency of their Law Societies, settle what the conventional rule should be among them? and this would be a guide to smaller towns.—Yours, &c.,

October 26, 1857.

A PERPETUAL COMMISSIONER.

TRANSFER OF LAND.

To the Editor of THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL & REPORTER.

SIR,—Sir F. Kelly expresses it as his opinion, that, in two or three years, the owners of almost all the landed property in England would, if they had the power, establish their ownership, and obtain a parliamentary title.

Of course, this must be done by producing a proper abstract of title for investigation. Who is to peruse these abstracts, and advise on the titles? Has Sir F. Kelly calculated how many million sheets of abstract would be required to deduce the titles of all the property in England? Assuming all this to be done, and land to be transferable by a certificate, or entry in a book, after the manner of stock, who is to guarantee against fraud?

Sir F. Kelly says, we never hear of this, practically, in the case of stock! And why? Because the Bank of England are obliged to make good the loss to the party defrauded; and the same in the case of any public company or private bank.

Will Parliament guarantee losses of this sort by fraud and forgery?—Yours, &c.,

October 24, 1857.

JOHN MARTIN.

Review.

Principles and Maxims of Jurisprudence. By JOHN GEORGE PHILLIMORE, Q.C., Reader on Constitutional Law and Legal History to the Four Inns of Court.—London: John W. Parker & Son. 1856.

Mr. Phillimore has many of the qualities which go to make a great jurist. He has a wide knowledge of different systems, an appreciation of general principles, a dislike of mere technicalities, a sincere love of truth, and an earnest desire to render service to his generation by an unflinching exposure of abuses. What he wants is the judicial mind; the calm, dispassionate weighing and balancing of conflicting points; the self-control that puts aside the first suggestions of imagination, anger, and contempt; the habit of stating, not only the truth, but, what is so difficult, nothing more than the truth. He is probably the most abusive writer that has written, in this century, on a grave subject. He exhausts the dictionary of invective in pouring out his wrath against English judges and English law. The consequence is, that his books are entertaining, but unimpressive. The reader at once perceives with whom he has to deal—with a headstrong, impulsive, impracticable man. Very often he is right, and what he says is well worthy of attention; but very often he is only half right, unfair, narrow in the scope of his criticism. In the volume now before us, his principal aim is to show that the Roman law was immeasurably superior to the English. If it were really necessary at the present day to controvert the old maxim, that the English law is the perfection of reason, there would be some justification for the vehemence with which Mr. Phillimore insists on a proposition which is incontestable. But every one is agreed that the Roman law has all the advantage over the English, which must attach to a scientific system, when compared with an agglomeration of principles, forms, and decisions connected by little else than the bond of a historical sequence. This once ad-

mitted, we come to a further question, whether it is desirable that a nation should have no legal history of its own, but, long before it has attained the stage of thought, when a scientific system is found congenial, should adopt, in a mass, the finished product of an advanced society. In England the progress of jurisprudence has certainly been slow, but it has always maintained a correspondence with the progress of the nation. When the nation has made a great leap, law has made a leap too. The two great eras of legal change in England—the reigns of Charles II. and William IV.—followed immediately on the occurrence of great national convulsions. If, therefore, the law of a nation is to be a part of the national life, England has substantially pursued the right path. Signs are not wanting that the time is come when England may advantageously investigate her own law by the light of other systems, and when the introduction of a comprehensive and scientific character into English jurisprudence would seem natural, because connected with similar steps taken in other spheres of thought and practice. A familiarity with the Roman law will make such a change possible in a degree far beyond what any other auxiliary can offer. But we derive little benefit from hearing expressed, in varying combinations of outrageous invective, the very simple truism, that, before England attained the point when the science of law was thought of, her jurisprudence was much more unscientific than the most scientific system which has ever been known.

We will not, therefore, give our readers any specimens of what occupies so large a space of Mr. Phillimore's work—the abuse of English law—but prefer to draw attention to the legal value of his book, both in its general character, and in its contents. The notion of expounding law through a collection of its leading maxims has been already adopted by an English lawyer, and was suggested in its application to Roman law by D'Aguesseau, who saw that the title in the Digest "*De Regulis Juris*" might be made the framework of a very instructive commentary on Roman law. Mr. Phillimore has taken about seventy of the most important maxims of Roman law, collected instances to illustrate them, and then shown how far English law has adopted or departed from them. He has done this with much learning, liveliness of style, and clearness of thought; and no one who knows enough of Roman and English law to understand the volume can fail to derive great profit from reading it carefully and attentively. We cannot, however, avoid noticing a small but annoying defect, which certainly diminishes the pleasure of perusing it. It is full of the most extraordinary typographical blunders. There is scarcely a Latin or Greek quotation which is not disfigured by glaring mistakes; and scarcely a page where some sentence, travestied and complicated by licences of printing and punctuation, does not try the patience of the reader.

A maxim is a short summary of the leading point determined in a great many decisions of similar cases, real or imaginary. In proportion as it is expressed, at once lucidly and tersely, it fastens on the memory, and becomes rooted in the mind. The form of expression is, therefore, of the very greatest importance; and the Latin language was so admirably adapted for the purpose, that no modern language can in the least compete with it. When once the maxim is firmly grasped in the mind, its use is to form a starting point for the speedy decision of fresh cases. But all the cases submitted for decision may not be similar, but only nearly similar; and then the maxim serves as a starting point to judge of the degree of similarity. Perhaps this is the chief use of a maxim—to test the degrees of similarity in cases nearly alike. We see, perhaps, at once that the case is one where the maxim is, if not applicable, at least nearly applicable. We, therefore, have at once advanced a long way towards deciding the case; for we throw on it, so to speak, a sort of *onus probandi*, or necessity of exhibiting some reason why it should not come within the scope of the maxim. The exceptions to maxims thus bring out the full force of the maxim, and illustrate the success with which it has originally been framed. In fact it is generally much easier to remember the extent of the application of a maxim by bearing in mind a prominent exception than by thinking of instances where it applies. The exceptions to maxims are therefore the most important part of the subject to the student, and they may, we believe, be ranged under three heads: 1. Exceptions arising from the terms of the maxim; 2. Exceptions arising from the facts of the case; and 3. Exceptions arising from conflicting principles of law.

An instance of exceptions under the first head may be drawn from the exceptions to the maxim "*Res judicata pro veritate accipitur*." Here the term *res judicata* is so short as to be

ambiguous; and until we clear up what is meant by *res judicata* we shall have cases apparently embraced in the rule which we shall have to exclude, or, in other words, we shall have exceptions. In the first place, *judicata* means *judicata inter eosdem*—the parties must have been the same. Then, again, the judgment must bear immediately on the points at issue. The decision of a collateral matter, from which a particular state of things might be inferred, is not conclusive as to the existence of that state of things. Then, again, a familiar distinction is drawn in international law, according as the judgment has been *in rem* or *in personam*, the decision in the former case being conclusive, and in the latter only of *prima facie* validity, and in many systems not even possessing that degree of weight. We might add other limitations and distinctions which it is necessary to introduce before we arrive exactly at the meaning of the terms of the maxim, but those we have given will suffice to exemplify the exceptions which arise from verbal ambiguity. For an instance of the class of exceptions arising from the facts of the case, we may refer to the maxim, "*Rati habitio mandato aequipollet*." The terms of the maxim are clear: we know what an order is, and what the ratification of an order is, but in practice doubts arise whether the order or the ratification has been given. For example, nice questions arise as to the state of circumstances which will imply a ratification. There may be acts of the principal which are ambiguous in character, as leaving unanswered a letter announcing the intention of the agent, or there may be a crisis in a person's affairs when any aid extended to him would be held to imply a corresponding obligation to recompense that aid. In all such cases we have to study the minute details of the particular case submitted to us, and it is only then that we can pronounce whether the maxim applies.

Lastly, a maxim may be inapplicable because it is contravened by a principle of law of higher force; and this may be either because it comes in collision with some positive and definite head of law, as when a maxim of private law has to yield to a maxim of public law, or because the circumstances are such that it would be contrary to good sense and the exigencies of daily life that the maxim should prevail in its full rigidity. In such cases—to speak technically—an equity is raised. A man, for instance, is bound to return what he has borrowed; but if the thing borrowed has been applied to a proper use, but to one which demands a long time to supply the place of the thing borrowed, the owner must allow the borrower sufficient time. The reader will find some valuable remarks on the general nature and import of maxims in Mr. Phillimore's book, under the heading "*Regula est qua rem quæ est breviter enarrat*." It would, perhaps, have been better if Mr. Phillimore had placed at the beginning of his book the discussion on this title, which is of an introductory character. In conclusion, we must repeat, that, in spite of the many faults which lower the tone of this volume, and which will, we fear, greatly impair its effect, it is a really valuable work—sound in conception, well executed, and calculated to bring home to the minds of English lawyers the uses to which they may turn a knowledge of the *Corpus Juris*.

National Association for the Promotion of Social Science.

DEPARTMENT I.—JURISPRUDENCE AND AMENDMENT OF THE LAW.

We propose to give abstracts of some of the more important papers which necessarily received very brief notice in our general report of proceedings published last week.

Tuesday, Oct. 13.—THE TRANSFER OF LAND.

Mr. Wakefield's Paper.

The object of this paper was to direct public attention to the defective operation of that branch of our law which regulates the sale and transfer of land, and the social mischiefs consequent thereupon; and to consider briefly some of the remedies which had been proposed. The writer first observed upon the object and expense of the abstract of title, and the investigation incident to it; and that the cost was the same for one acre as for 1,000 acres.

Mr. Sweet, in his evidence before Commissioners, gave a table of purchase-money and cost of transfer in various instances, and showed that the tax increased in inverse proportion with the value of the land, being hard on the humbler classes of purchasers, and recurring with every sub-sale. This result was

not contemplated by the law, but was an excrescence of a defective law.

After showing the practical operation of the present law, the writer proceeded to remark on its social effects, observing that industrial habits are one of the great elements of civilisation and national greatness; that the most active and potent agent in the promotion of this habit was the acquisition of property; and that landed property was that, of all others, most desired by the industrial classes; and hence he argued that a state of law which, by the imposition of purely artificial obstacles, not only impedes, but actually interposes an insuperable barrier to the acquisition of property by these classes, must in effect relax one of the mainsprings of national industry, and produce many social evils.

The removal of the shackles on the transfer of land would produce many advantages—it would lessen the crowding of dwellings, and restrain emigration of skilled and industrious men.

As to Remedies.—After showing that a register of assurances would increase the expense of transfers of land, and was unnecessary for sake of security, he pointed out that the objects of a remedy should be—1, To diminish the expense incidental to the transfer of land; 2, to diminish delay; and 3, to do so without impairing security of title.

The means hitherto attempted as a remedy had been—1, A registration of assurances; 2, a registration of title; 3, a plan proposed by the author of the present paper—a certificate of title to be granted to every owner of land who should apply for it, and prove that he was owner in fee, upon which certificate was to be indorsed a memorandum of every subsequent deed; 4, a plan recommended by the late Commissioners, of certificates of title and a register of titles.

The advantages of a certificate of title would be, that, by fixing a recent date for root of title (for none would begin earlier than the certificate), the expense of abstracts, and of consequent investigation, would be diminished, and the length of conveyances reduced, as recitals would not be necessary.

The author then compared advantages of registry of title with those of indorsement on certificate of subsequent deeds, observing that registry of title would increase the expense of transfer, although it might diminish delay; would render impossible the dealing with the title deeds for purposes of deposit, and thus check the "transfer of the symbol being equivalent to the transfer of the original," which was required by the exigency of commerce, and was regarded by the author "as a valuable principle, and one of the triumphs of civilisation." On the other hand, the plan of the certificate and indorsement would widely extend this principle, impart greater value to title deeds, by greatly facilitating the use made of them by persons engaged in commerce.

Mr. Fawcett's Paper.

As a necessary step to a system of registration, it was necessary to reduce all tenures to one class—say freehold—then let the county be divided into districts for purposes of registration, to be under the jurisdiction of a chief registrar and registrars of divisions. The next step would be, to provide a plan on which every field and house should be laid down and designated by a letter or figure; on every transfer the parties to appear personally or by attorney before registrar of district, who should make transfer at once, as the steward of copyhold court did; and no description should be permitted beyond the letter or figure which stands for the field or house on the district map. And on the register should be entered a document merely stating the names of the parties, the number of the parcels on plan, the consideration, and the nature of the transaction, whether sale, mortgage, &c., and no covenants. The name of no person to appear on the register except the name of the person in whom the legal estate is vested. Deeds containing trusts to be produced to registrar, and by him stamped with office seal; and parties beneficially interested may enter caveats.

The author proposed that owners in fee might at once be placed on the register, and that heirs-at-law and devisees should, within twelve months, be required to register their lands; that a shorter period of possession with registration than is now required should give an indefeasible title; and that a certificate from the registrar should be the only abstract of title to which a purchaser should be entitled.

As to the cost of transfers, the author proposed that a fee should be paid to registrar, and that solicitors should be paid a per-centage.

The author concluded by recommending, that, until a system of registration should be adopted, the provisions of Lord Brougham's Act (8 & 9 Vict.) should be made imperative, and

that no deed should be valid that was not prepared in conformity with it.

Wednesday, Oct. 14.—THE BANKRUPTCY LAWS.

Mr. S. S. Lloyd's Paper.

Mr. Lloyd commenced by observing on the unpopularity of the Bankruptcy Courts, and on the preference given in cases of insolvency to assignments; stating, on the authority of Mr. Perry's evidence before the Lords' Committee, that there were nine assignments to one bankruptcy in the years 1850 to 1853; the numbers being 29,885 estates administered by assignment, and 3,325 bankruptcies. This was a striking contrast with Scotland, where a resort to the Court was the rule, and private arrangement the exception. Mr. Lloyd attributed the difference to the fact, that, in Scotland, the control of the creditors was exercised in many matters in which in England they had no voice; and, whilst the expense in Scotland was about 8 per cent., in England it was 50 per cent. on the assets.

The author expressed his approval of codifying the law of bankruptcy, and advocated the abolition of the distinction between bankruptcy and insolvency; but it was deemed by the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce wiser to attempt the amendment of the statutes of 1849 and 1854, and Mr. Lloyd proceeded to explain the objects of the Bill prepared by that body.

It was proposed to charge the court fees, salaries, and compensations on the Consolidated Fund, leaving, as the only charges on the estates of bankrupts, the expenses of collecting and distributing the assets; to reduce the stamp now charged on petition to a small sum, and charge the remainder on the adjudication. This would be acceptable to the creditor, and increase the revenue.

The Bill also contained clauses for the objects following:—To abolish the offices of messenger and broker, and to transfer their duties to the official assignees and their servants; power to tax bills of auctioneers, valuers, and accountants, in the same manner as solicitor's bills; to remunerate official assignees by salary of £600 a year, and a commission of 1½ per cent. on assets collected, and of 2½ per cent. on amounts paid for dividends; to limit the power of the commissioners in granting allowance to bankrupt up to certificate meeting, by requiring the sanction of the assignees; to reduce the rent payable to landlords from twelve to six months.

As to solicitors' charges—which constituted on an average more than one-third of the entire expense of administration, and frequently exceeded all other items combined—it was stated that they were made for the professed discharge of duties which appertained, not to the solicitor, but to the trade assignee or some one else. It was proposed to remedy this evil by disallowing all charges for services for which the written authority of the trade assignee should not be produced, by transferring to registrar the duty of issuing advertisements; by simplifying proof of debts; diminishing the number of public sittings; and by extending power of the commissioner to try all actions for debt at the suit of assignees.

Mr. Lloyd estimated these changes would reduce the expenses from 50 to 24 per cent.

It was further proposed by the Bill to enable the commissioners to dispose of certain business in chambers, and decide disputes on special case—to appoint a mercantile man as assessor in certain cases to assist commissioner. And as great complaints had been made of the irregularity in the attendance of the commissioners in some courts, it was proposed to enable the Lord Chancellor to appoint substitutes for commissioners, who should be paid out of the salary of the absentees.

The following objects were also provided for by the Bill:—To make solicitors of seven years standing eligible as registrars; to increase the sum which official assignee is permitted to have under his control from £1,000 to £2,000; to declare brokers, accountants, and clerks to official assignees, as well as merchants, to be eligible to office of official assignee.

As to acts of bankruptcy, the declaration of inability to meet engagements, and the affidavit for trader debtors' summons, to be filed at court of that district where trader has carried on business, and not, as now, where he resides. The levying execution on goods of a trader to be an act of bankruptcy. If creditor file affidavit of debt, and give notice thereof to trader, and demand immediate payment, then if creditor be not satisfied in fourteen days, trader to be deemed to have committed an act of bankruptcy; to enable Court to order money to be raised by mortgage, if bankrupt's debts can be paid by money so raised; also, under special circumstances, to postpone sale

and make orders for management in meanwhile; to enable commissioner to order pensions, &c., to vest in assignees; that bankrupts, in preparing balance-sheet, shall have assistance of official assignee; and commissioner may order further assistance at expense of estate in special cases. The present system of preparing balance-sheet was strongly condemned, as tending to mislead the Court, and screen the bankrupt from merited censure.

As to proof of debts—It was proposed that creditors should deliver to official assignee a statement of their accounts with bankrupt, with a declaration added that it was a true and complete statement (false statement to be a misdemeanor). Official assignee to examine these statements, and report to the commissioner the result. Court may, on application of assignees or creditor, require further proof, or examine claimants.

As to audit and dividends—It was proposed to adopt the Scotch plan—namely, trade assignee to audit accounts of official assignee one month before each dividend, and file certificate of audit; and, if account not approved, to file the reasons for non-approval. First dividend to be paid at four months; second, at eight months; and third, if any, at ten months from adjudication, without public sitting of court. At expiration of twelve months from adjudication, a public sitting to be held for the audit of official assignee's account; and order to be then made for winding up estate. Previously to public audit, the accounts to be examined by trade assignee, and printed copy sent to every creditor of £10 and upwards seven days previously to the audit meeting. Trade assignee to be paid for his trouble. Official assignee to send dividend warrant by post, at the request and risk of creditors.

As to certificate—To abolish classification; to omit from list of offences the loss by gaming of £20 in one day, at any previous period of life, and to confine it to one year previously to bankruptcy; and to add to the offences punishable by suspension of certificate the loss of £200 by time bargains, not keeping proper books during two years, and having paid or allowed an exorbitant rate of interest.

Mr. Lloyd suggested that the power of imprisonment on withdrawal of protection should not be continued; that the Court alone should have this power; and that, where certificate is refused, the Court should be required to award some imprisonment to the bankrupt.

As to arrangements under control of Court—It proposed that the property of petitioner should vest in the assignee immediately on filing of petition; the Court, by order, to re-vest it if petition dismissed; and that no notice to creditors should be required beyond a notice in *London Gazette*.

As to arrangement by deed or memorandum—It was proposed to extend the power to compositions or inspection deeds, and to those cases of assignment where only part of trader's property is included.

As to the administration of the estates of deceased insolvents—The provisions of Lord St. Leonard's Bill of 1853 had been adopted.

ON THE EFFECT OF COMMERCIAL LEGISLATION UPON COMMERCIAL MORALITY.

Mr. W. Hawes' Paper.

Mr. Hawes commenced his paper by the expression of his opinion, that the law, being the best schoolmaster, should promote commercial morality, and not tend (as he thought it sometimes did) to support commercial fraud.

Our commercial legislation encouraged criminal fraud and immorality—

1. By laws imposing prohibitory or such high taxes and duties, that profit, out of all proportion to the risk incurred, was secured by their evasion.

2. By our bankruptcy and insolvency laws, which treat honest misfortune and errors of judgment with the same obloquy as fraud, extravagance, and recklessness.

3. By our law of partnership, which throws difficulties in the way of the removal and punishment of a fraudulent partner; and

4. By incumbering the pursuit of justice with so many forms and technicalities, and involving such sacrifices of time and money, that it was often better to submit to a fraud, and to forego a right, than to attempt, by the aid of the law, to punish one, or to secure the other.

In illustration of the first division of his subject, and to show that the law afforded temptations and facilities for the commission of criminal fraud, Mr. Hawes stated that frauds were committed most readily against the Government, and next to the

Government against companies, rather than against firms or individuals.

Every one engaged in home or foreign trades, subject to high or prohibitory duties, must know how constantly he was exposed to the temptation of evading them.

Look, too, at the income-tax returns. Who is there who believes in the smallness of the number of persons in trade (804 only) returning incomes for £900 and £1,000 a year? And yet this is vouched by a positive declaration, which few would make to defraud a neighbour or a friend. It should be the first duty of Government to consider how taxes might be imposed so as to obtain the largest revenue, and afford the least temptation to fraud.

The same temptation to commit fraud against and by public companies exists. Friendship, interest, and ability to take and dispose of shares decide their appointments; and the dishonesty of many of their acts he attributed to a want of independence of thought and action, to a want of a deep sense and love of justice, and to other causes. In this way, and because the business matters of companies were not conducted as between two private men, the commercial morality of public companies had been so much lowered, and their proceedings had become so notorious for want of honourable dealing, as to induce a distinguished judge to characterise them as having neither bodies to be kicked, nor souls to be damned.

On the second point of the subject, Mr. Hawes went on to observe that the first principle of our bankruptcy law was erroneous.

It adopted the fundamental principle, that a trader, failing to pay his debts, had a right to be relieved by law from present and future liability, without the consent of his creditors. Mr. Hawes proceeded to show the absurdity and injustice of the distinction between traders and non-traders, and the encouragement it gave to fraud; and that no law of bankruptcy would be based on right principles until there was a clear distinction between those who became liable to it under honest and dishonest circumstances. He believed the principle of the Insolvent Court to be the right one; and that by creditors alone ought release from debts to be given.

The law ought to interfere between creditor and debtor—

1. To protect the debtor's person from arrest.

2. To secure an equitable and speedy distribution of his assets.

3. To restrain any vindictive exercise of power by a small body of creditors.

4. To regulate proceedings under which a debtor may be brought before the Court.

5. To record the orders and decisions of the Court and creditors, and to see that no impediment should prevent the free exercise of the bankrupt's talents and industry, and the recovery of his character in trade.

6. To punish with certainty and severity any commercial fraud or dishonesty.

With respect to the way in which the law incumbered the pursuit of justice, Mr. Hawes observed, first, upon the value of the county courts; however, stating that their expenses should be reduced; and that the tendency which existed to induce plaintiffs to employ attorneys—instead of advocating their claims themselves—could not be too much checked.

Much evil and injustice was caused by the delay of hearing causes in court, which evil ought to be removed; and all unnecessary forms and technicalities cut away.

Mr. Hawes then called attention to the 17th section of the Statute of Frauds, excluding from the law's operations unwritten contracts, of which he strongly disapproved, and said that it did not lessen, but encouraged fraud.

The action of the client was restricted. The system of etiquette observed between barristers and solicitors, and the custom of remunerating a solicitor for his services by fixed rules, irrespective of real talent, could not be too soon abrogated.

By delays of law. He particularly alluded to the trial of causes in the country, which took place but twice a year, and at which great expense was incurred; and complained of the indolent habit of some judges of forcing parties in court to a reference, after all the preliminary expenses had been incurred; for it was clear, that, if the parties had not deemed the decision of a superior judge of more value than that of a junior barrister, they would not have carried their cause into court at all.

In conclusion, Mr. Hawes expressed his belief that commercial morality was yet high, despite the blotches on its fame that occasionally came to light; and hoped the time would come when every one would look to the law as his surest friend, and when all its proceedings, however varied by custom, should be

based upon sound principles, and administered with such a stern regard to justice, that it would always protect the right, and punish the wrong.

(To be continued.)

Chancery Judges' Chambers.

Regulations to be observed in the Conduct of Business at the Chambers of the Master of the Rolls and the Vice-Chancellors, by order of the Right Honourable Sir JOHN ROMILLY, Master of the Rolls; the Honourable the Vice-Chancellor Sir RICHARD TORIN KINDERSLEY; the Honourable the Vice-Chancellor Sir JOHN STUART; and the Honourable the Vice-Chancellor Sir WILLIAM PAGE WOOD—this 8th day of August, 1857.

I. Summonses are not to be altered after they are sealed, except upon application at chambers, and any alterations then made will be marked with the seal of such chambers.

II. Upon applications for time to answer, a printed copy of the bill and the interrogatories to be answered are to be produced.

III. Whenever any matter is adjourned from the court to chambers, or any directions are given in court, to be acted upon at chambers, whether upon a matter adjourned into court from chambers, or upon any other occasion, without an order being drawn up, a note signed by the registrar, stating for what purpose such matter is adjourned to chambers, or the directions given, is to be procured from the registrar, and left at chambers.

IV. In drawing up decrees and orders to be left at chambers, the solicitors are to take care that every account, inquiry, sale, direction to appoint receiver, and other direction to be answered at chambers, is numbered consecutively according to the form set forth in the schedule C referred to in the General Order, No. 8, of 16th October, 1852, and that the other directions are not numbered.

V. At the same time that any decree or order made in a suit instituted by bill or claim is left at chambers, a print of the bill or claim is to be left.

VI. A note stating the names of the solicitors for all the parties, and showing for which of the parties such solicitors are concerned, is to be left at chambers with every decree or order.

VII. For the purpose of procuring the direction of the judge as to the manner of serving notice of a decree or order, pursuant to the 5th General Order of 1st June, 1854,

The plaintiff is to make an *ex parte* application by summons, and thereupon to show by affidavit as far as he is able—

1. With respect to Infants.

The ages of the infants.

Whether they have any parents or testamentary guardians, or guardians appointed by the Court of Chancery.

Where and under whose care the infants are residing, at whose expense they are maintained, and in case they have no father or guardian, who are their nearest relations.

And that the parents, guardians, relations, or persons upon whom it is proposed to serve the notice, have no interest in the matters in question, or, if they have, the nature of such interest, and that it is not adverse to the interests of the infants.

2. With respect to Persons of Unsound Mind not found so by Inquisition.

Where and under whose care such persons are residing, and at whose expense they are maintained.

Who are their nearest relations, and that such relations, or person upon whom it is proposed to serve the notice, have no interest in the matters in question, or, if they have, the nature of such interest, and that it is not adverse to the interest of the persons of unsound mind.

VIII. A copy of every certificate by a record and writ clerk of the entry of a memorandum of service of notice of a decree or order, and of every order giving liberty to a person served with such notice to attend the proceedings, certified by the solicitor, is to be left at chambers.

IX. Upon the notice of a claim having been entered at chambers by a creditor or other claimant served upon the solicitors in the cause, the number of the entry of the claim is to be stated.

X. Every alteration in an account verified by affidavit to be left at chambers is to be marked with the initials of the commissioner or officer before whom the affidavit is sworn, and such alterations are not to be made by erasures with the knife or other instrument.

XI. Accounts, extracts from parish registers, particulars of

creditors' debts and other documents referred to by affidavit, are not to be annexed to the affidavit, or referred to in the affidavit as annexed, but are to be referred to as exhibits.

XII. Every certificate on an exhibit referred to in an affidavit signed by the commissioner or officer before whom the affidavit is sworn, must have the short title of the cause or matter.

XIII. Affidavits for the purpose of enabling the judge to fix reserved bids are to state the value of the property, by reference to an exhibit containing such value, so that the value may not be disclosed by the affidavit when filed.

XIV. As soon as particulars and conditions of sale settled at chambers have been printed, two prints thereof, certified by the solicitor to be correct prints of the particulars and conditions settled at the judges' chambers, are to be left at chambers.

XV. An office copy of the affidavit of the person appointed to sell, of the result of the sale, with the bidding paper and particulars therein referred to, are to be left at chambers at least one clear day before the day appointed for settling the certificate of the result of the sale.

XVI. Receivers' accounts are to be delivered at chambers on or before the day appointed for that purpose, and, in default, the receiver will be liable to the consequences imposed by the General Order of April 23, 1796.

XVII. All accounts, copies, and papers, left at chambers, are to be written upon foolscap paper bookwise, unless the nature of the document renders it impracticable to do so.

XVIII. Where any cause originating in chambers shall, at the original or any subsequent hearing thereof, have been adjourned for further consideration, such cause may, after the expiration of eight days, and within fourteen days from the filing of the certificate of the chief clerk of the judge to whose court the cause is attached, be brought on for further consideration by a summons to be taken out by the plaintiff or party having the conduct of the cause, and after the expiration of such fourteen days, by a summons to be taken out by any other party. And such summons is to be in the form prescribed by the Order No. 1 of the 16th October, 1852, and set forth in the schedule A thereto; and the object of the application may be stated as follows:—"That this cause, the further consideration whereof was adjourned by the order of the — day of —, 185—, may be further considered."

This summons is to be served six clear days before the return.

XIX. Upon applications for the appointment of guardians of infants and allowance for maintenance, the evidence is to show—

1. The ages of the infants.

2. The nature and amount of the infants' fortunes and incomes.

3. What relations the infants have.

XX. Upon applications to obtain the sanction of the Court to infants making settlements on marriage, under the Act of 18 & 19 Vict. c. 43, evidence is to be produced to show—

1. The age of the infant.

2. Whether the infant has any parents or guardians.

3. With whom or under whose care the infant is living, and if the infant has no parents or guardians, what near relations the infant has.

4. The rank and position in life of the infant and parents.

5. What the infant's property and fortune consists of.

6. The age, rank, and position in life of the person to whom the infant is about to be married.

7. What property, fortune, and income such person has.

8. The fitness of the proposed trustees and their consent to act.

The proposals for the settlement of the property of the infant and of the person to whom such infant is proposed to be married, are to be submitted to the judge.

XXI. For the purpose of procuring the appointment of a guardian to infants under the Act of Parliament of 19 & 20 Vict. c. 120, and the 10th General Order of 15th November, 1856—

A summons should be taken out in the names of the infants by a next friend, in the form used for originating proceedings in chambers, intituled in the same manner as the petition or intended petition—That —, or some other proper person or persons, may be appointed guardian or guardians of the said infants, for the purpose of making an application on behalf of the said infants [or consenting on behalf of the said infants to an application] to the Court, under the provisions of the above Act. In case the application to the Court is to be made on behalf of the infants, the guardian must be appointed before the petition is presented. If the guardian is to consent

to an application, the guardian may be appointed either before or after the petition is presented.

Upon the application to appoint such guardian, the following evidence is to be adduced:—

1. The age of the infant.
2. Whether he has any parent, testamentary guardian, or guardian appointed by the Court of Chancery.
3. Where and under whose care the infant is residing, and at whose expense he is maintained.
4. In what way the proposed guardian is connected with the infant, and why proposed, and how qualified to be appointed.
5. That the proposed guardian has no interest in the intended application, or if he has, the nature of his interest, and that it is not adverse to the interest of the infant.
6. The consent of the guardian to act.
7. The nature of the intended application to the Court.

XXII. For the purpose of procuring the direction of the judge for leave to make or consent to an application on behalf of infants or lunatics under the said Act of 19 & 20 Vict. c. 120, and the 10th General Order of November 15, 1856, a summons is to be taken out after the petition is presented in the ordinary form, intituled in the same manner as the petition, by the guardian of the infants or committee of the lunatic, that he may be at liberty, on behalf of the infant or lunatic, to make the application [or consent to the application] to the Court proposed to be made by the petition presented to the Lord Chancellor [or Master of the Rolls] on the — day of —.

Upon this application the guardian or committee should make an affidavit that he believes it to be proper and for the benefit of the infant or lunatic that the application proposed to be made should be made [or consented to], on behalf of the said infant or lunatic, and such other evidence, if any, should be adduced, as the circumstances of the case may require, to show the propriety of the application so far as the infant or lunatic is concerned, and the petition should be produced.

XXIII. For the purpose of procuring the directions of the judge, pursuant to the 3rd General Order of November 15, 1856,

A summons is to be taken out after the petition has been answered, intituled in the same manner as the petition, that directions may be given in what newspapers the notices required by the Act are to be inserted.

The petition is to be produced on the return of the summons, and the judge's direction will be written on the petition and signed by his Chief Clerk.

XXIV. The forms set forth in the schedule hereto are to be adhered to, and only to be varied in so far as may be necessary to meet the circumstances of the case.

(Signed) { JOHN ROMILLY, M. R.
RICHARD T. KINDERSLEY, V. C.
JOHN STUART, V. C.
W. P. WOOD, V. C.

Court Papers.

Chancery.

SITTINGS—MICHAELMAS TERM, 1857.

LORD CHANCELLOR.

At Westminster.

Monday, Nov. 2...App. Mtns. & Apps.

At Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, Nov. 3...Ptns. & Appeals.

Wednesday 4

Thursday 5

Friday 6

Saturday 7

Monday 9

Tuesday 10

Wednesday 11...App. Mtns. & Apps.

Thursday 12

Friday 13

Saturday 14

Monday 16

Tuesday 17

Wednesday 18...App. Mtns. & Apps.

Thursday 19

Friday 20

Saturday 21

Monday 23

Tuesday 24...Ptns. & Appeals.

Wednesday 25...App. Mtns. & Apps.

MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

At Westminster.

Monday, Nov. 2...Motions.

At Chancery Lane.

Tuesday, Nov. 3...Gen. Ptn. Day.

Wednesday 4

Thursday 5

Friday 6

Saturday 7

Monday 9

Tuesday 10

Wednesday 11...Motions.

Thursday 12

Friday 13

Saturday 14

Monday 16

Tuesday 17

Wednesday 18...Motions.

Thursday 19

Friday 20

Saturday 21

Monday 23

Tuesday 24...Gen. Ptn. Day.

Wednesday 25...Motions.

N.B.—Short Causes, Short Claims,

Consent Causes, Unopposed Petitions,

and Claims, every Saturday. The Unopposed Petitions to be taken first.

NOTICE.—Consent Petitions must be presented, and Copies left with

the Secretary, on or before the Thursday preceding the Saturday on which it is intended they should be heard.

THE LORDS JUSTICES.

At Westminster.

Monday, Nov. 2...App. Motions.

At Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, Nov. 3...App. Mtns. & Apps.

Wednesday 4

Thursday 5

Friday 6

Saturday 7

Monday 9

Tuesday 10

Wednesday 11...App. Mtns. & Apps.

Thursday 12

Friday 13

Saturday 14

Monday 16

Tuesday 17

Wednesday 18...App. Mtns. & Apps.

Thursday 19

Friday 20

Saturday 21

Monday 23

Tuesday 24

Wednesday 25...App. Mtns. & Apps.

V. C. SIR R. T. KINDERSLEY.

At Westminster.

Monday, Nov. 2...Motions.

At Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, Nov. 3

Wednesday 4

Thursday 5

Friday 6

Saturday 7

Monday 9

Tuesday 10

Wednesday 11...Mtns. & Gen. Paper.

Thursday 12

Friday 13

Saturday 14

Monday 16

Tuesday 17

Wednesday 18...Mtns. & Gen. Paper.

Thursday 19

Friday 20

Saturday 21

Monday 23

Tuesday 24

Wednesday 25...Mtns. & Gen. Paper.

V. C. SIR JOHN STUART.

At Westminster.

Monday, Nov. 2...Motions.

At Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, Nov. 3

Wednesday 4

Thursday 5

Friday 6

Saturday 7

Monday 9

Tuesday 10

Wednesday 11...Mtns. & Gen. Pap.

Thursday 12

Friday 13

Saturday 14

Monday 16

Tuesday 17

Wednesday 18...Mtns. & Gen. Paper.

Thursday 19

Friday 20

Saturday 21

Monday 23

Tuesday 24

Wednesday 25...Mtns. & Gen. Paper.

V. C. SIR W. PAGE WOOD.

At Westminster.

Monday, Nov. 2...Motions.

At Lincoln's Inn.

Tuesday, Nov. 3

Wednesday 4

Thursday 5

Friday 6

Saturday 7

Monday 9

Tuesday 10

Wednesday 11...Mtns. & Gen. Paper.

Thursday 12

Friday 13

Saturday 14

Monday 16

Tuesday 17

Wednesday 18...Mtns. & Gen. Paper.

Thursday 19

Friday 20

Saturday 21

Monday 23

Tuesday 24

Wednesday 25...Mtns. & Gen. Paper.

NOTICE.—Claims will be placed in the Paper after Short Causes, &c., on each Saturday, in precedence of the General Paper.

CAUSE LISTS.—MICHAELMAS TERM, 1857.

The following Abbreviations have been adopted to save space:—

A. Abated—Adj. Adjourned—A. T. After Term—App. Appeal—C. B. Cause Day—Cl. Claim—Cts. Costs—D. Demurrer—Ex. Exceptions—F. B. Further Directions—Mtn. Motion—P. C. Pro Confesso—Pl. Plea—Ptn. Petition—R. Rehearing—S. O. Stand Over—Sh. Short.

LORD CHANCELLOR.

APPEALS.

Dixon v. Gayfer
Ditto v. Ditto
Fluker v. Gordon
Caddick v. Skidmore
Warden v. Jones

Dempster v. Graham
Randfield v. Randfield
Cotesworth v. M'Gachen
Fowler v. Wyatt
Perry Herrick v. Attwood

MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

CAUSES, &c.

Reade v. Woodroffe (Exons. to ans)
Maxwell v. The Port Tenant Patent
Steam Fuel & Coal Co. (Cause)
Smith v. Same Defts. (do.)
Swinfen v. Swinfen (do.)
Swinfen v. Swinfen (do.)
Attorney-Gen. v. Dean and Canons
of Windsor (M. for dec.)
Somersetshire Coal Canal Co. v.
Harcourt (do.)
Tweddle v. Hulme (do.)
Allen v. Herring (do.)
Sturgis v. Morse (Cause)
Rennie v. Young (do.)
Wheaton v. Graham (do.)
Lowe v. North (do.)
Blincow v. White (M. for dec.)
Mott v. Goode (Cause)
Boag v. Stanfen (M. for dec.)
Stanfen v. Boag (do.)
Alopp v. Bell (Cause)
Lent v. Hillas (do.)
Austen v. Boys (do.)
Denton v. Lord J. Robt. Mannors
(Fur. con. and sums. to vary cert.)
Duncan v. Shuter (M. for dec.)
Smith v. Pavier (do.)
Waller v. Barrett (Fur. cons. and
sums. to vary certificate)
Mocatta v. Bell (M. for dec.)
Timmis v. Steele (do.)
Feakes v. Standley (Sp. case)
Dalton v. Thompson (Cause)
Fornaby v. Davies (M. for dec.)
Heather v. O'Neill (Cause)
Townley v. Carter (M. for dec.)
Scammel v. Graham (do.)
Bainbridge v. Bainbridge (Cause)
Serjeant v. Nicholls (M. for dec.)
Powell v. Powell (do.)
Williams v. Page (Cause)
Hagley v. Gummer (M. for dec.)
Atherton v. Langford (Sp. case)
Cook v. Head (M. for dec.)

Keley v. Keley (do.)
 Child v. Jones (Fur. cons. and sums. to vary certificate)
 Ward v. Tyrrell (Cause)
 Baxter v. Charlesworth (M. for dec.)
 Tracy v. Butcher (do.)
 Attorney-Gen. v. West (Cause)
 Jeans v. Cooke (do.)
 Holgate v. Jennings (Fur. cons. and sums. to vary certificate)
 Smith v. The Metropolitan Board of Works (Cause)
 Prince v. Iline (M. for dec.)
 Scott v. Sheppard (Cause)
 Brown v. Brown (M. for dec.)
 Ellis v. Bartrum (Fur. cons. and Bartrum v. Ellis } two sums. to vary certificate
 Landon v. Landon (M. for dec.)
 King v. Spencer (Claim)
 Harrison v. Drew (Sp. case)
 Vyryan v. Braddon (Fur. cons.)
 Shepherd v. Churchill (do.)
 Moore v. Petchell (Fur. cons. and summons to vary certificate)
 Smith v. Smith (Fur. cons.)
 Crosher v. Willey (M. for dec.)
 Baker v. Colmer }
 Pryce v. Dendy } (Fur. dirs. & csts.)
 Pryce v. Shaw }
 Bigg v. Strong (Cause)
 Arrowsmith v. Wetherell (Fur. cons.)
 Levy v. Stens (Claim)
 McDonald v. Richardson (M. for dec.)
 Lewy v. Syer (Claim)
 Brunsell v. Caird (Fur. cons.)

Carrington v. Younghusband (Caus.)
 Birds v. Askey (Fur. cons.)
 Cleverley v. Cleverley }
 Cleverley v. Whiteor } (F. dirs. & csts.)
 England v. Entham }
 Blackford v. Blackford (M. for dec.)
 Crallan v. Oulton (6) (Fur. d. & cst.)
 Morley v. Morley (M. for dec.)
 Humphreys v. Richards (Fur. cons.)
 Gambett Taylors' Co. v. Truscott (F. cons. & m. to vary certificate)
 Garnett v. Acton (Fur. cons. & two sums. to vary certificate)
 Daves v. Ridgway (Fur. cons.)
 Britton v. Mars (Cause)
 Dods v. Dufton (Claim)
 Campbell v. Vandervell (Cause)
 Tucker v. Loveridge (M. for dec.)
 Lake v. Brutton (Fur. cons.)
 Annandale v. Beckwith (M. for dec.)
 Ridgway v. Newstead (do.)
 Harvey v. Addington (do.)
 Griffiths v. Howard (do.)
 Chancellor v. Morecraft (4) (Fur. dirs. and costs)
 Jenkins v. Homfray (M. for dec.)
 Talbot v. Stephenson (Cause)
 Richardson v. Martin (M. for dec.)
 Heap v. Head (do.)
 Saunders v. Norris (do.)
 Hardwicke v. Hardwicke (do.)
 Rayner v. Terry (do.) [short]
 Conder v. Dalton (Fur. cons.)
 Dalton v. Conder } cons.
 Simpson v. Beattie (Cause)

Stevens v. Stevens (Mtn. for dec.)
 Russell v. Green (Fur. cons.)
 Grange v. Warner } (F. D. & csts.)
 Grange v. Warner }
 Debney v. Eckert (Fur. cons.)
 Horn v. Colman (do.)
 Fisk v. Norton (3) (do.)
 Howorth v. Tolson (Mtn. for dec.)
 Field v. Field (Cause)
 Burgess v. Moxon (Fur. cons.)
 Attorney-General v. Harvey (F. D. and costs)
 Powell v. Pritchard (Mtn. for dec.)
 Greenwood v. Greenwood (F. cons.)
 Aymer v. Bodger (Mtn. for dec.)
 Churchill v. Holmes (do.)

Hall v. Fox (do.)
 In re Broker's Estate } (F. cons. & summons to vary certificate)
 Brooker v. Brooker }
 Brooker v. Brooker }
 Munk v. Cole (Fur. cons.)
 Harrison v. Deacon (Mtn. for dec.)
 Kaye v. Kaye } (Fur. cons.)
 Kaye v. Tees }
 Ellis v. Ellis } (F. C. & two sums. to vary certificate)
 Cocks v. Stanley (Mtn. for dec.)
 Alford v. Jaquet (do.)
 Neve v. Thompson (do.)
 Laen v. Alvey } (Mtn. for dec.)
 Laen v. Alvey }
 Price v. Watson (Fur. cons.)

VICE-CHANCELLOR SIR WILLIAM P. WOOD.

CAUSES, &c.

Snelgar v. Chambers (M. for dec. pt. hd.)
 Hayter v. Tucker (Fur. con. pt. hd.)
 Farebrother v. Arkell (Cause, pt. hd. restored by order)
 Smith v. Allfree (demr.)
 The Commissioners of Sewers for the Levels of Havering, Dagenham, Ripple, &c. v. Victoria London Dock Co. (do.)
 Milsome v. Long (Cause)
 Chambers v. Flood (M. for dec.)
 Marsland v. Mittrachi (Cause)
 Fox v. Jackson (M. for dec.)
 Purser v. Darby (do.)
 James v. Page } (Cause)
 Mingay v. Page }
 Brown v. The London Necropolis and National Mausoleum Co. (M. for dec.)
 East Anglian Railway Co. v. Goodwin (Cause)
 Robins v. Pearce (M. for dec.) [Nov. 10th]
 Forbes v. Forbes (Cause)
 Jones v. Hudson (do.)
 Crowther v. Sutcliffe (do.)
 Kilson v. Shaw (M. for dec.)
 Keith v. Partridge (do.)
 Hansom v. Reece (do.)
 Cutler v. Cutler (do.)
 Lomax v. Sutton (do.)
 Shaw v. Fryer (do.)
 Sanders v. Clayton (do.)
 Hamond v. Walker (do.)
 Emerson v. Mason (do.)
 McMahon v. Herne (Cause)
 Attorney-Gen. v. Pretymann (Ex. to Master's report.)
 Attorney-Gen. v. Dean, &c. } of Lincoln
 Attorney-Gen. v. Pretymann } (Fur. cons.)
 Attorney-Gen. v. Dean, &c. } of Lincoln
 Attorney-Gen. v. Pretymann } (F. D. & csts.)
 Attorney-Gen. v. Bp. Lincoln } (F. D. & csts.)
 Richardson v. Adams (M. for dec.)
 Soar v. Foster (Cause)
 Grinstead v. Marsh (do.)
 Clubb v. Harris (do.)
 Talbot v. Kemshead (do.)
 Handley v. Worthington (M. for d.)
 Merryweather v. Walker (Sp. case)
 Alexander v. Alexander (M. for d.)
 Brown v. Stockton and Darlington Railway Co. (do.)
 Wilkinson v. Wilkinson (Cause)
 Chappell v. Haynes (Sp. case)
 Hill v. Walker (Cause)
 Wycherley v. Barnard (M. for dec.)
 Goodman v. Robinson (do.)
 Vandenberg v. Palmer (Cause)

Bourdillon v. Roche (Cause)
 Martin v. The West of England Fire and Life Insurance Co. (do.)
 Beavan v. Macqueen (do.)
 Hughes v. Evans (do.)
 Robinson v. Preston (M. for dec.)
 Jackson v. Price (do.)
 Whitmore v. Lane (do.)
 Taylor v. Roebuck (do.)
 Manchee v. Kay (do.)
 Meates v. Bell (do.)
 Horsfall v. Garnett (Cause)
 Davies v. Dimsdale (do.)
 Gardsen v. Dugdale (do.)
 Lord Ongley v. Lindsell (do.)
 Pole v. Sandy (do.)
 Carrington v. Carrington (do.)
 Ernest v. Cutts (Cause pro con.)
 The Official Manager of the Atheneum Life Assurance Society v. Bartlett (Cause)
 The Official Manager of the Atheneum Life Assurance Society v. Pooley (do.)
 Kennett v. Hunt (do.)
 Hutchins v. Osborne (Sp. case)
 Wythes v. Labouchere (Cause)
 Burrell v. Moffatt (M. for dec.)
 Fairbank v. Murgatroyd (Fur. con.)
 Birch v. Summer (Claim)
 Hiron v. Bowme (Fur. cons.)
 Perkins v. Owen (Cause)
 Crosthwaite v. Dean (Fur. cons.)
 Tabor v. Pooley (do.)
 Walker v. Peddie (do.)
 Blake v. Holford (do.)
 Wilkes v. Jones (do.)
 Taylor v. Millington (do.)
 Mumford v. King (M. for dec.)
 Mitchell v. Barles (Cause)
 Brooksbank v. Frith (do.)
 Freyre v. Brade (M. for dec.)
 Lloyd v. Attwood (Cause)
 Attwood v. Lloyd (do.)
 Dixon v. Peel (Fur. cons.)
 Southall v. Matthews (Cause)
 Benson v. Sari (do.)
 Ashley v. Fox (Claim)
 Webb v. Webb (M. for dec.)
 Green v. Eastern Counties Railway Co. (Cause)
 Perkins v. Mellor (Fur. cons.)
 Powell v. Aiken (Cause)
 Abbott v. Blair (do.)
 Gelye v. Duke of Montrose (do.)
 Be Curn Elgia Quarry Slate & Slab Co. (Limited) v. Lee (M. for dec.)
 Foster v. Strong (Cause)
 Harries v. Williams (M. for dec.)
 Nottley v. Izant (Cause)
 Earp v. Lloyd (M. for dec.)

LORDS JUSTICES.

APPEALS.

Robson v. Lord Devon
 Skelton v. Cole
 Lyle v. Earl of Yarborough
 Yem v. Edwards [ampton]
 Harrison v. Mayor, &c., of South-

Glover v. Weedon
 Farebrother v. Gibson
 King v. King
 Ford v. Heeley

VICE-CHANCELLOR SIR R. T. KINDERSLEY.

CAUSES, &c.

Gardiner v. Slater (F. C.)
 Price v. Pugh (F. D. and costs)
 Gray v. Downman (M. for dec.)
 Halby v. Grey (F. C.)
 Johnson v. Routh (Cause)
 Violet v. Finch (do.)
 Bozzoni v. Rogerson (do.)
 Broadhurst v. Garrard (M. for dec.)
 Lord v. Colvin (Cause)
 Colvin v. Lord (do.)
 Cochran v. Cochran }
 Barton v. Colvin } Rehearing
 Lord v. Colvin }
 Lord v. Colvin }
 Moorhouse v. Colvin (Cause)
 Staunton v. Barrington (do.)
 Selby v. Fraser (do.)
 Nevin v. Smith (M. for dec.)
 Fox v. Charlton (do.)
 Tarnatt v. Lloyd (F. C.)
 Merlin v. Murphy (M. for dec.)
 Davison v. Trevellion (do.)

Bond v. Bell (Cause)
 Esdall v. Neale (M. for dec.)
 Webster v. Bradley (do.)
 Davenport v. Davenport } (F. C.)
 Booth v. Wise }
 Sharpnell v. Sharpnell (do. short)
 Addison v. Bell (M. for dec.)
 Bell v. Bell (do.)
 Dodson v. Sammel (F. C.)
 Prince v. Stevens (Cause)
 Boulinois v. Taylor (do. short)
 Kenrick v. Wilcox (F. C.)
 Pooley v. Quilter (Cause)
 Wayne v. Lewis } (F. C.)
 Wayne v. Parke }
 Farrer v. Dayne (F. C.)
 Ewart v. Williams } Ex. to Master's report
 Williams v. Ewart }
 Foster v. Dawber (M. for dec.)
 Scott v. Deffell (F. C.)
 Sterky v. Holmes (Cause)
 Holmes v. Sterky (do.)

VICE-CHANCELLOR SIR JOHN STUART.

CAUSES, &c.

Barnes v. Thrupp (D.)
 Simpson v. Chapman } (F. C. and Mtn. to vary certificate)
 Scott v. The Mayor, &c., of Liverpool (Cause)
 Birch v. Sewell } (Two mtns. to vary Chf. Clerk's certf.)
 Wedderburn v. Wedderburn (Mtn. for dec.)
 Southern v. Sidney (do.)
 Hutton v. Taylor } (Cause)
 George v. Taylor }
 Cory v. Watts (Mtn. for dec.)
 Brook v. Brook } (Fur. cons.)
 Richardson v. Lodge (Cause)
 Lodge v. Pritchard (F. D. & csts.)
 Hannam v. Sims (Mtn. for dec.)
 Alderson v. White (Cause)
 Cottrell v. Ledsam (Mtn. for dec.)
 Smith v. Page (Cause)
 Harrison v. Hamerton (M. for dec.)
 Harris v. Morgan (Cause)
 Spring v. Haslett (Fur. cons.)
 Bird v. Mayhew (Mtn. for dec.)
 Parker v. Haswell (do.)
 Bower v. Goslett (do.)
 The Oriental Bank Corporation v. Calrow (do.)

The Oriental Bank Corporation v. Nicholson (do.)
 Williams v. Roberts (do.)
 Meynell v. Wright (Cause)
 Griggs v. Wakeling (Mtn. for dec.)
 Ravenhill v. Smith (Cause)
 Hawks v. Mullins (Fur. cons.) (S. O.)
 Redhead v. Stevenson (M. for dec.)
 Shaw v. Walker (Fur. cons.)
 Birch v. Sewell } (Fur. cons. & two mtns. to vary certf.)
 Fox v. Newstead (Mtn. for dec.)
 Sugden v. Crossland (Fur. cons.)
 Welsh v. Colquhoun (do.)
 Doyle v. Riddell (Mtn. for dec.)
 Dawson v. Dawson (do.)
 Robertson v. Norris (Cause)
 Cobb v. Mostyn (Mtn. for dec.)
 Hollis v. Bryant (Fur. cons.)
 Hamilton v. Arrowsmith (do.)
 Morgan v. Higgins (do.)
 Walton v. Wright (Cause)
 Trappes v. Roskell (Fur. cons.)
 Swift v. Swift (do.)
 Walker v. Whitehouse (M. for dec.) (Short)
 Vorley v. Cooke (Cause)
 Cooke v. Vorley (do.)
 Wilkinson v. Redhead (do.)
 Latchford v. Fowkes (do.)

Queen's Bench.

ENLARGED RULES.—MICHAELMAS TERM, 1857.

To the First Day of Term.

Rose v. Caldwell.
 In the matter of Harrison Padmore, Gent., one, &c.
 Ex parte James Greenwood.
 The Queen v. The Inhabitants of the Township of Royton.
 The Queen v. The Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of Liverpool.
 The Queen v. Joseph Arnold and Another, Justices of Berks, Inhabitants of East Haybourn.
 The Queen v. Same, Inhabitants of West Haybourn.
 The Queen v. Llynvi Valley Railway Co.

Tuesday, Nov. 24.

The Queen v. The Guardians of the Poor of the City of London Union.

SPECIAL PAPER.

For Judgment.

Dem. The Queen v. Eton College and Another.

For Argument.

Dem. Chamberlaine v. Willoughby and Another (stands for arrangement).

Dem.	The London Dock Company v. Sinnott.
Dem.	Elder v. Beaumont and Another (to come on for argument with Rule in New Trial Paper).
Sp. Case.	Goodwin v. Noble and Others.
Co. Cot. Ap.	Silvester v. Hampson.
Sp. Case.	The North Staffordshire Railway Company v. The London and North-Western Railway Company.
Dem.	Lazard v. Spartali.
Sp. Case.	Benomi and Wife v. Backhouse.
"	Wallis v. Same.
"	Longstaff v. Same.
"	Robinson v. Same.
"	Thompson v. Same.
Dem.	Jones and Others v. Swayne and Another.
Co. Cot. Ap.	Wadlow v. Rides.
Dem.	Ollivier and Another v. Lovell.
Dem. to 4th Plea.	Cornell v. Hudson.
Dem. to Re- plication to 7th Plea.	Same v. Same.

NEW TRIAL PAPER.—EASTER TERM, 1857.

Northumberland. Heald v. Pickersgill (stands over).

Tried during Term.

Middlesex. Tennant v. Field.

TRINITY TERM, 1857.

Middlesex.	Chapman v. Van Toll.
"	Van Toll v. Chapman.
"	The case of Power and Another v. Burchall (to come on for Argument with these Rules).
London.	Travis v. South Eastern Railway Company and Another.
"	Ridear v. Salisbury.
"	Heineky v. Earl and Others.
"	Elder v. Beaumont (Dem. and this Rule to come on together).

Tried during Term.

Middlesex.	Peyron and Another v. Kennard.
"	Munro v. Butt.
"	Randle v. Gould and Another.
"	Read v. Plummer.
"	Power and Another v. Burchall.

CROWN PAPER.—MICHAELMAS TERM, 1857.

Saturday, Nov. 7.

Staffordshire.	The Queen on the prosecution of James Mann, Respondent, v. Thomas Bourne, jun., Appellant.
Surrey.	The Queen v. The Board of Works of the District of St. Olave, Southwark.
Norwich.	The Queen on the prosecution of The Norwich Waterworks Company, Respondent, v. John B. Snowden and two Others, Appellants.
Middlesex.	The Queen on the prosecution of The Vestrymen of St. Marylebone, Respondents, v. The Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society of London, Appellant.
Derbyshire.	The Queen v. William Wake.
Portsmouth.	The Queen v. Alexander Stewart.
"	The Queen v. Edward Edwards.
"	The Queen v. J. J. Lake.
"	The Queen v. E. Stansby.
"	The Queen v. Henry Wm. Breton.
"	The Queen v. Thos. Foster.
Oxfordshire.	The Queen v. Richard Woods.
Cumberland.	The Queen on the prosecution of John Bird, Respondent, v. P. Henry Howard, Appellant.
Glamorgan.	The Queen on the prosecution of The Cardiff Board of Health, Respondent, v. The Taft Vale Railway Company, Appellant.
"	Same v. Same.
Dover.	The Queen on the prosecution of The Mayor, &c., of Dover, Respondents, v. Wm. Richardson, Appellant.
Hants.	The Queen v. William Padwick.
Staffordshire.	William H. Walker, Plaintiff in error, v. The Queen, Defendant in error.
Cambridgeshire.	The Queen v. The Inhabitants of the Parish of Horningsea.
Gravesend.	The Queen on the prosecution of Frederick Banks, Respondent, v. Thomas Stanton, Appellant.
Sunderland.	Benjamin Hannagan, Appellant, v. The Overseers of the Parish of Bishopwearmouth, Respondents.
Carmarthen.	Lemon Thomas, Appellant, v. Evan Evans, Respondent.
Middlesex.	The Board of Works for the Poplar District, Appellants, v. Nicholas Knight and Another, Respondents.
"	John Jay, Appellant, v. Henry John Hammon, Respondent.
"	The Queen on the Prosecution of The Trustees of the Poor of the Parish of St. John, Hackney, Respondents, v. The Rev. Thos. Oliver Goodchild, Clerk, Appellant.
"	Same v. The Rev. Thomas Davis Lamb, Clerk, Appellant.

Common Pleas.

DEMURRER PAPER.—MICHAELMAS TERM, 1857.

Monday, Nov. 2	} Motions in arrest of Judgment.
Tuesday, Nov. 3	
Wednesday, Nov. 4	
Thursday, Nov. 5	

Special Arguments.—Wednesday, Nov. 11.

Dem.	Surr v. Lee.
Nisi Pri. Ca.	Carpenter v. Parker.
Sp. Case.	Bedford v. The Warden and Society of the Royal Town of Sutton Coldfield.
"	Silvester v. Bedford, Clerk.
Co. Cot. Ap.	Weaver, Appellant, v. Joule and Others, Respondents.
Sp. Case.	Poppleton v. Buchanan.

Sp. Case.	Egerton and Ux. v. Massey and Others.
"	Powis v. Butler and Another.
"	Fry v. Russell.

Friday, Nov. 13.

Dem. Tabor and Others v. Edwards.

Wednesday, Nov. 18.

REMANET PAPER.—ENLARGED RULES.

To the First Day of Term.

In the matter of the complaint of Nicholson and Another v. The Great Western Railway Company.

To the Sixth Day of Term.

In the matter of the complaint of Baxendale and Others v. The North Devon Railway Company.

In the matter of the complaint of Harris and Another v. The Cockermouth and Workington Railway Company.

In the matter of the complaint of Thomas Moy v. The Eastern Counties Railway Company.

Walker and Ux. v. Whitaker (enlarged until proceedings in Chancery are disposed of).

Walker v. Bartlett (enlarged until the application in action in Exchequer is disposed of).

NEW TRIALS.—EASTER TERM, 1857.

London.	Last v. Edwards.
Kent.	Neyler and Another v. Passfield.
Middlesex.	King v. The Accumulative Life Fund and General Assurance Company.
"	Horlor v. Carpenter.
"	Mathews and Another v. Feuilan.

TRINITY TERM, 1857.

Middlesex. Bennett and Others v. Herring and Others.

FOR JUDGMENT.

Simmonds v. Tayler, Public Officer, &c.

Roberts v. Eberhardt.

Laws and Another v. Rand.

Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

BIRTHS.

BLOXAM—On Oct. 27, at 20 Gloucester-terrace, Hyde-park-gardens, the wife of Edward Bloxam, Esq., of a daughter.

CURREY—On Oct. 25, the wife of Edmund Charles Currey, Esq., of Doctors'-commons, of a son.

LEWERS—On Oct. 27, at Dartmouth-house, Forest-hill, Kent, the wife of William Lewers, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a son.

PATERSON—On Oct. 22, at Sheffield-gardens, Kensington, the wife of W. B. Paterson, Esq., of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

MACE—BUCKLER—On Oct. 27, at Brixton, by the Rev. Dr. Harrison, William Glover Mace, Solicitor, Tenterden, Kent, to Charlotte Search, second daughter of Henry Peach Buckler, of Camberwell, Surrey.

OWEN—TEAGUE—On Oct. 22, at St. Mark's, Kennington, by the Rev. J. Lingham, M.A., Rector of St. Mary's Lambeth, Henry James Owen, Esq., of St. Alban's-road, Kensington, to Elizabeth Anne, second daughter of Charles Brooks Teague, Esq., of The Lodge, South Lambeth.

DEATHS.

LINDSEY—On Oct. 25, Mr. George Lindsey, of Albion-grove West, Barnsbury, aged 51, for thirty-six years of the Admiralty Solicitor's Office.

OLIVER—On Oct. 22, at 6 Park-road, Regent's-park, Henry Oliver, Esq., Proctor, of Doctors'-commons.

TOWSEY—On Oct. 20, at Hammersmith, Edward Towsey, of Quality-court, Chancery-lane, Solicitor.

NICHOLSON—On Oct. 28, aged 51, George Stewart Nicholson, Esq., of Doctors'-commons, younger son of the late William Nicholson, Esq., of St. Margaret's, Rochester.

Unclaimed Stock in the Bank of England.

The Amount of Stock heretofore standing in the following Names will be transferred to the Parties claiming the same, unless other Claimants appear within Three Months:—

CURLING, THOMAS BLIZARD, Surgeon, King's-rd., Bedford-row, £100 New 3 per Cents.—Claimed by THOMAS BLIZARD CURLING.
HINTON, THOMAS, Victualler, Wayman-st., Birmingham, and PENELOPE HINTON, his wife, £100 New 3 per Cents.—Claimed by PENELOPE HINTON, Widow, the survivor.
HURLOCK, PHILIP, Gent., St. George's-row, Chelsea, £1 per annum Long Annuities; and PHILIP HURLOCK, Gent., St. George's-row, Pimlico, £250 Consols.—Claimed by JAMES JOSIAH MILLARD, administrator.
INGLE, JOHN, Currier, Cambridge, £2,000 New 3 per Cents.—Claimed by MARY ANN INGLE, Widow, acting executrix.
STEDMAN, JAMES, Surgeon, JOHN RAND, Solicitor, and THOMAS HAYDON, Banker, all of Guildford, Surrey, £60 New 3 per Cents.—Claimed by JAMES STEDMAN and THOMAS HAYDON, the survivors.
SYMONS, WILLIAM, Master Mariner, Falmouth, £100 Consols.—Claimed by JANE SYMONS, Widow, sole executrix.

Wills at Law and Dept of Kin.

Advertised for in the London Gazette and elsewhere during the Week.

CLARENZA, JULIA COUNTESS (who died Sept. 5, 1846), Widow, formerly of Blackheath, Kent, afterwards of Torquay, Devon, and late of Dawlish.—Her next of kin to apply by letter to Brickwood & Brooks, Proctors, 6 Dean's-st., Doctors'-commons.

LUCK, LAWRENCE (a brother of HESTER LUCE, lately deceased, and whose family formerly lived at Berkeley, Gloucestershire), or his children, to apply by letter to Mr. Adey, Solicitor, Wotton-under-Edge.

Money Market.

CITY, FRIDAY EVENING.

The present week has been a time of great commotion on the Stock Exchange. English Securities have fluctuated very much. The closing price of Consols this afternoon is 89½ to 89¾ per Cent., being fully one per Cent. better than this day week. Numerous investments on the part of the public continue to be made, which materially strengthen the market. The demand for money has been very great at the Bank and in Lombard Street. The effect of deficiencies on the part of America, upon our finances and trade, is believed to be not yet fully developed.

The amount of specie intended for shipment to India and China by the next mail packet, is said to be about £900,000, which includes a certain proportion of the additional loan of one million taken by the East India Company to be shipped to the East Indies in silver by instalments. The terms of this loan are 6 per Cent interest, and for two years certain. One half is believed to be in the course of advance by the London and Westminster Bank, and the other half by other banking establishments. The returns of the Board of Trade for the month of September, 1857, show a considerable increase in exports when compared with the month of September, 1856. A large part of this increase is attributable to an advance of price in the raw material. The increase is nearly equal to that which appeared in the month of August, but very much less than was shown in several of the previous months of the present year.

From the Bank of England return for the week ending the 24th October, 1857, which we give below, it appears that the amount of notes in circulation is £19,766,265, being a decrease of £416,980, and the stock of bullion in both departments is £9,369,794, showing a decrease of £154,684 when compared with the previous return.

It would be unreasonable to suppose that the amount of commercial disorder which, in the United States, has brought affairs into their present position could fail to produce in this country great pecuniary difficulties and a material falling off in trade. We surely have a right to feel satisfaction and pride that our merchants, bankers, and traders have, during so many weeks, maintained a position of general stability and solvency. No surprise ought to be felt, that, at the eleventh hour, long-protracted defalcation in remittances from America is disabling many establishments, recently of acknowledged credit and stable resources, from duly meeting their liabilities.

The failure of the Liverpool Borough Bank was announced on Tuesday, and all expectation of the regular resumption of its business appears to be given up. It is mentioned that the liabilities of this bank amount to a million, all of which it is hoped will be discharged. Arrangements have been made by which the Western Bank of Scotland, at Glasgow, would be fully enabled to meet any difficulties likely to arise, but on condition that the establishment shall be ultimately wound up. The deposits in this bank are reported to amount to about six millions. In London, and other seats of trade, and also in the manufacturing districts, many large failures have occurred during the week, others are anticipated, and business is paralysed.

Nothing less serious could be expected to ensue upon the intelligence that a long list of banks in New York and Boston have suspended their payments of specie. Lately these banks were represented as the bulwarks of credit. Now they are liable to the reproaches of the daily press for having, it is said, been the cause of an immense amount of ruin by continuing so long the struggle to make cash payments. Having now failed, the public are requested to believe that universal bankruptcy, or almost universal bankruptcy, is immediately to bring about a return of prosperity. According to the adage that, when things are at the worst they must mend, this expectation may be reasonable. If the circulating medium in the United States is to do its work for some indefinite time with little or no aid from specie, some part of the hard cash due to this country will probably be remitted. Such remittances will be encouraged by the high rate of interest here, which tends to check the transmission of bills, especially of bills the intention with regard to which might be to get them discounted on this side for the purpose of returning the proceeds in gold. Banks of issue in the United States promise, of course, to pay their notes on demand, but there appears very inadequate security for the fulfilment of this promise. According to the constitution of American banks, a deposit of securities is made in proportion to their issues. These deposits have not, like gold and silver, the certainty of

being available at all times and for all occasions. They consist of stocks, and shares, and mortgages. These may be good for ultimate security, but some time must elapse in the usual state of affairs before such assets can be converted into cash; and in a time of general distrust the delay is prolonged, and in the meanwhile extensive ruin takes place.

The decrease of bullion reported by the Bank in the four weeks ending the 24th instant, amounts to about £1,900,000. The arrivals from the gold-producing countries during the last two weeks have replaced only a small amount of the specie taken for exportation, the demand for which continues to some extent. According to the evidence of the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank, taken before the select committee on the Bank Act, this demand has existed and been in progress constantly, with very small intervals, during the last six years, and, according to their estimate, has amounted to £56,530,000, the larger proportion being silver for India and China. Their evidence also shows, that, large as this amount is, it is by much the smaller part of the precious metals imported during the same period, the amount of which they estimate at £135,000,000.

It is a question of great importance how the remaining very large amount has been disposed of; and the evidence of the Bank authorities throws a curious and interesting light upon that question. They estimate that the increase to the European stock of bullion in those years is £79,000,000; this includes the addition which has been made to the circulation of this country, which addition, in respect to gold, is estimated, but without any certain data, at about £14,000,000. The circulation of gold in previous years is supposed to have been from thirty-six to forty millions, and to have increased of late years to about fifty millions, which increase has been called for by the increased wealth and trade of the country. As this increase has absorbed not more than about £14,000,000 of the £79,000,000 before mentioned, the sum of £65,000,000 remains as increase to the European stock of bullion, exclusive of the gold taken into circulation in this country. Notwithstanding these facts, the demand upon the Bank has existed as before mentioned, and has reduced the stock of bullion in that establishment from between fourteen and fifteen millions, the amount held in 1851, to between nine and ten millions, the amount held in the present year.

English Funds.

ENGLISH FUNDS.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.	Fri.
Bank Stock	210	210 84	206 7	208 5 7	209 7	209
3 per Cent. Red. Ann.	87 ½	87 ½	88 ½	87 ½	88 ½	88 ½
3 per Cent. Cons. Ann.	88 ½	88 ½	89 ½	88 ½	88 ½	89 ½
New 3 per Cent. Ann.	87 ½	88 ½	88 ½	88 ½	87 ½	88 ½
New 3 ½ per Cent. Ann.	7 ½
5 per Cent. Annuities
Long Ann. (exp. Jan. 5, 1860)	2	2	1 13-16	...
Do. 30 years (exp. Oct. 10, 1859)	1 13-16	1 13-16	...
Do. 30 years (exp. Jan. 5, 1860)
Do. 30 years (exp. Apr. 5, 1865)	17 ½	...	17 ½	17 ½
India Stock	208 9	208 ½	211 ½	209 210	209 ½
India Bonds (£1,000)	35s. dis.	40s. dis.
Do. (under £1,000)	40s. dis.	45s. dis.	45s. dis.
Exch. Bills (£1,000) Mar.	11s. dis.	15s. dis.	15s. dis.	15s. dis.	11s. dis.	...
June
Exch. Bills (£500) Mar.	15s. dis.	10s. dis.	10s. dis.	15s. dis.
June
Exch. Bills (Small) Mar.	15s. dis.	10s. dis.	10s. dis.	15s. dis.	14s. dis.	...
June
Exch. Bills Advertised
Exch. Bonds, 1858, 3 ½ per Cent.
Exch. Bonds, 1859, 3 ½ per Cent.	97 ½	97 ½	97 ½	...	97 ½	97 ½

Bank of England.

AN ACCOUNT, PURSUANT TO THE ACT 7TH AND 8TH VICTORIA, C. 32, FOR THE WEEK ENDING ON SATURDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1857.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT.

	£		£
Notes issued	23,252,105	Government Debt	11,015,100
		Other Securities	3,459,900
		Gold Coin and Bullion	8,77,105
		Silver Bullion
	£23,252,105		£23,252,105

BANKING DEPARTMENT.

	£		£
Proprietors' Capital . . .	14,553,000	Government Securities	
Reserve . . .	3,239,499	(Incl. Dead Weight	
Public Deposits (Includ-		Amalgam) . . .	10,254,541
ing Exchequer, Sav-		Other Securities . . .	20,404,597
ings' Banks, Commis-		Notes . . .	3,485,840
sioners of National		Gold and Silver Coin . .	592,689
Debt, and Dividend			
Accounts) . . .	4,861,740		
Other Deposits . . .	11,263,986		
Seven day & other Bills	819,442		
	£34,737,667		£34,737,667

Dated the 29th day of October, 1857.

M. MARSHALL, Chief Cashier.

Railway Stock.

Railways.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.	Fri.
Bristol and Exeter	83 4	83	...
Caledonian . . .	79 9	78 7 8	78 7 7	77 3 7	77 3 7	77 3 8
Chester and Holyhead	30 1	...	30 1
East Anglian . . .	18 1 8	...	18 1	...	18 1	18 1 8
Eastern Union A stock
East Lancashire	90
Edinburgh and Glasgow	61 1
Edin., Perth, & Dundee	27 1	27 1	27 1
Glasgow & South Western
Great Northern . . .	93	94 1	93 1	93 1	94 1	94 1 5
Gt. South & West. (Ire.)	97 1	...	97 1 8	97 1 8
Great Western . . .	51 1 1	51 1 1	51 1 1	51 1 1	50 1 1	50 1 1
Lancashire & Yorkshire . .	93 2 1	92 2 1	92 2 1	92 2 1	92 2 1	92 2 1
Lon., Brighton, & S. Coast	103 2	102 1	102 1	102 1	102 1	103 1
London & North Western	95 1	95 1	95 1	95 1	96 1	96 1
London & S. Western . .	89 1	89 1	88 1	88 1	88 1	88 1
Man., Shef., and Lincoln . .	82 1 1	81 1 1	81 1 1	81 1 1	81 1 1	82 1 1
Midland . . .	82 1 1	81 1 1	81 1 1	81 1 1	81 1 1	82 1 1
Norfolk
North British
North Eastern (Berwick)	92 1 1	91 1 1	91 1 1	91 1 1	91 1 1	91 1 1
North London
Oxford, Worc. & Wolv.	29 1	...	29 1	...	30 1
Scottish Central
Scot.N.E. Aberdeen Stock	22 1	22 1	22 1
Shropshire Union . . .	46 1	47 1
South-Eastern	63 2 1	62 1 1	63 1	63 1
South-Wales	81 1

Insurance Companies.

Equity and Law . . .	6
English and Scottish Law . . .	4
Law Fire . . .	41
Law Life . . .	63
Law Reversionary Interest . . .	19
Law Union . . .	par
Legal and Commercial . . .	par
Legal and General Life . . .	24
London and Provincial . . .	24
Medical, Legal, and General . .	par
Solicitors' and General . . .	par

London Gazettes.

Bankrupts.

TUESDAY, OCT. 27, 1857.

HANCOCK, SIR SAMUEL, Kt. (Williams & Co.), Cattle-dealer, Emmetts, Eden-bridge, Kent; also Chemist and Druggist, of 8 Halken-st. West, Belgrave-sq., Middlesex. *Pat. Oct. 26. Nov. 6, at 12, 30; Basinghall-st. Com. Evans. Off. Ass. Bell. Sols. Lawrance, Flews, & Boyer, Old Jewry-chambers.*

HAYDEN, BENJAMIN, Linendraper, 33 Bermondsey-st., Bermondsey. *Pat. Oct. 24. Nov. 6, at 11, and Dec. 4, at 11, 30; Basinghall-st. Com. Evans. Off. Ass. Bell. Sols. Edwards, 15 Coleman-st.*

INGALL, HENRY, Wine Merchant, 23 Crutched-frars. *Pat. Oct. 23. Nov. 6, at 2, 30, and Dec. 1, at 2; Basinghall-st. Com. Holroyd. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sols. Cotterill & Sons, 32 Throgmorton-st.*

KERBY, CHARLES WILLIAM, Contractor, Nottingham. *Pat. Oct. 24. Nov. 10 and Dec. 1, at 10, 30; Shire-hall, Nottingham. Com. Balguy. Off. Ass. Harris. Sols. Sollory, Nottingham; or Reece, Truro-chambers, New-st., Birmingham.*

LINGS, JOHN BENJAMIN, & JOHN LINGS (Lings & Son), Cheesemongers, High-st., Southwark. *Pat. Oct. 16. Nov. 6 and Dec. 8, at 12; Basinghall-st. Com. Holroyd. Off. Ass. Lee. Sols. Linklaters & Hackwood, 17 Sise-la, London.*

MANDELBAUM, DAVID, Importer of Foreign Goods and Merchandise, 12 & 13 Minorities. *Pat. Oct. 21. Nov. 7 and Dec. 8, at 12; Basinghall-st. Com. Fonblanque. Off. Ass. Stansfeld. Sols. Lloyd & Rule, 25 Milk-st., City.*

MONAGHAN, PATRICK, Newspaper Proprietor, Wolverhampton, Staffordshire. *Pat. Oct. 24. Nov. 6 and Dec. 11, 30; Birmingham. Com. Balguy. Off. Ass. Christie. Sols. Neve, Wolverhampton; or Hodgson & Allen, Birmingham.*

NICHOLSON, JOSHUA, Butcher and Cattle-dealer, Hexham, Northumberland. *Pat. Oct. 21. Nov. 8, at 11, and Dec. 8, at 11; Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Com. Ellison. Off. Ass. Baker. Sols. Baty, Hexham; Lowes, Haydon-bridge; or Watson, 10 Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

OLIVER, DAVID, Miller, Grange-mill, Kimberworth, Yorkshire. *Pat. Oct. 17. Nov. 7 and Dec. 5, at 10; Council-hall, Sheffield. Com. West. Off. Ass. Brewin. Sol. Broadbent, Sheffield.*

ROLFE, JOHN, jun., Tailor, 110 Leadenhall-st. *Pat. Oct. 23. Nov. 5, at 1, and Dec. 3, at 11, 30; Basinghall-st. Com. Evans. Off. Ass. Bell. Sols. Morris, Stone, Townson, & Morris, Moorgate-st.-chambers.*

ROSE, ISAAC, Jeweller, 45 Tooley-st., Southwark. *Pat. Oct. 26. Nov. 7 and Dec. 8, at 12, 30; Basinghall-st. Com. Fonblanque. Off. Ass. Graham. Sols. Wire & Child, St. Swithin's-la.*

SELF, JEREMIAH, Innkeeper, Crown Inn, Bishop's Waltham, Southampton. *Pat. Oct. 23. Nov. 6 and Dec. 1, at 2; Basinghall-st. Com. Holroyd. Off. Ass. Lee. Sols. Lawrance, Flews, & Boyer, 14 Old Jewry-chambers.*

SOMMERVILLE, THOMAS, Nurseryman, Abbey Nursery, Garden-rd., St. John's-wood. *Pat. Oct. 24. Nov. 6 and Dec. 4, at 12; Basinghall-st. Com. Evans. Off. Ass. Johnson. Sol. Oldershaw, St. Swithin's-la.*

WILKINSON, JOHN, Grocer, Warrington, Lancashire. *Pat. Oct. 12. Nov. 6 and Dec. 27, at 1; Manchester. Off. Ass. Hernaman. Sols. D. & R. Evans, Liverpool; or Sale, Worthington, & Shipman, Manchester.*

WOOD, JOSEPH, Timber Merchant, Salford, Lancashire. *Pat. Oct. 22. Nov. 9 and 30, at 11; Manchester. Off. Ass. Hernaman. Sol. Heath, Swan-st., Manchester.*

FRIDAY, OCT. 30, 1857.

BAKER, GEORGE, Flour Factor, King's Cottage, North End, Fulham. *Pat. Oct. 27. Nov. 13, at 2, 30, and Dec. 11, at 12; Basinghall-st. Com. Fane. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sols. Watson & Sons, 12 Bouverie-st., Fleet-st.*

BASTOW, HENRY, Mercer, Oldham-st., Manchester. *Pat. Oct. 24. Nov. 13, and Dec. 4, at 11; Manchester. Off. Ass. Hernaman. Sols. Cooper & Sons, Pall-mall, Manchester.*

CHAFF, WILLIAM TREBURY, Ironfounder, Devonport. *Pat. Oct. 24. Nov. 10, & Dec. 9, at 11; Queen-st., Exeter. Com. Bere. Off. Ass. Hirtzel. Sols. Hawker, Devonport; & Sloddon, Exeter.*

CLARKE, JAMES, Timber Merchant, Bridge Wharf, Kingsland. *Pat. Oct. 24. Nov. 17, at 2, 30, and Dec. 11, at 1; Basinghall-st. Com. Fane. Off. Ass. Whitmore. Sol. Chidley, 10 Basinghall-st.*

GOSSLING, GEORGE, Baker, 10 Upper Bemerton-st., Caledonian-rd., and 110 Curtain-rd., Shoreditch. *Pat. Oct. 27. Nov. 13, and Dec. 15, at 12; Basinghall-st. Com. Holroyd. Off. Ass. Lee. Sol. Degbie, 23 Essex-st., Strand.*

LAMPRELL, WILLIAM ALLISTON, Carpenter, 913 Long-la, City. *Pat. Oct. 28. Nov. 12, at 2, 30, and Dec. 15, at 12; Basinghall-st. Com. Holroyd. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sol. Broughton, 4 Falcon-sq.*

MASON, ROBERT HINDRY, Printer, now or late of Sunderland, Durham, and Tynemouth, Northumberland. *Pat. Oct. 20. Nov. 11, at 11, and Dec. 16, at 12; Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Com. Ellison. Off. Ass. Baker. Sols. Harle, Bush, & Co., 20 Southampton-bldgs., Chancery-la, London, and 2 Butcher-bank, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

Agents for Vandercom, Cree, Law, & Comyn, Bush-la, Cannon-st., Sols. to the petitioning creditors.

MENDEL, SAMUEL, Commission Agent, 172 Fenchurch-st. *Pat. Oct. 28. Nov. 7, at 12, 30, and Dec. 15, at 1; Basinghall-st. Com. Fonblanque. Off. Ass. Stansfeld. Sols. Lumley & Lumley, 4 Ludgate-hill.*

MUSTO, JAMES, JOSEPH MUSTO, & ROBERT WILLIAM MUSTO, Millwrights and Engineers, East London Iron Works, Cambridge-rd., Mile-end; carrying on business in partnership with John Musto and William Musto (John Musto & Co.). *Pat. Oct. 28. Nov. 10, at 12, 30, and Dec. 10, at 2; Basinghall-st. Com. Evans. Off. Ass. Johnson. Sols. Lawrance, Flews, & Boyer, Old Jewry-chambers.*

PEMBERTON, WILLIAM (Pemberton & Seymour), Commission Agent, 2 Barge-yard-chambers, Bucklersbury. *Pat. Oct. 27. Nov. 13, at 3, and Dec. 11, at 1; Basinghall-st. Com. Fane. Off. Ass. Whitmore. Sol. Moss, 4 Pancras-lane.*

RAWNSLEY, SAMUEL, Brush Manufacturer, Halifax, Yorkshire. *Pat. Oct. 27. Nov. 20 and Dec. 11, at 11; Commercial-bldgs., Leeds. Com. West. Off. Ass. Young. Sols. Wavell, Philbrick, & Foster, Halifax.*

ROGERS, EDWARD, Draper, Oswestry, Salop. *Pat. Oct. 29. Nov. 9 and 30, at 12, 30; Birmingham. Com. Balguy. Off. Ass. Whitmore. Sol. Bull, Oswestry; or Reece, Birmingham.*

LANE, JOSEPH, & GEORGE WACEY STEVENSON, General Merchants, 113 Fore-st., Cripplegate. *Pat. for Arrmt. Sept. 24. Nov. 12, at 2, and Dec. 8, at 12; Basinghall-st. Com. Holroyd. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sols. Stretton & Postans, 12 South-st.*

SUNDERLAND, EDWIN, & WILLIAM SUNDERLAND, Bill-brokers, Cinder Meadow Colliery, Oldbury, Worcestershire. *Pat. Oct. 22. Nov. 12 and Dec. 3, at 11, 30; Birmingham. Com. Balguy. Off. Ass. Whitmore. Sols. Southall & Nelson, Birmingham.*

TINDALL, GEORGE, Wheelwright and Blacksmith, Wickenby, Lincolnshire. *Pat. Oct. 28. Nov. 11 and Dec. 16, at 12; Town-hall, Kingston-upon-Hull. Com. Ayton. Off. Ass. Carrick. Sol. Brown, Lincoln.*

WATERS, WILLIAM EDWARD, Wholesale Milliner, 26 Haverstock-st., City-rd. *Pat. Oct. 28. Nov. 7, at 1, and Dec. 15, at 11; Basinghall-st. Com. Fonblanque. Off. Ass. Stansfeld. Sols. Deppre & Austin, 23 Lawrance-la, Chapside.*

WHITE, THOMAS GEORGE, Lace Warehouseman, 55 Aldermanbury. *Pat. Oct. 24. Nov. 13, at 2, and Dec. 11, at 12; Basinghall-st. Com. Fane. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sols. Rogers & Ford, 31 Lincoln's-inn-fields; or Brown, Nottingham.*

WHITMORE, HENRY, Tailor and Woollendraper, Stockport, Cheshire. *Pat. Oct. 26. Nov. 10 and Dec. 1, at 1; Manchester. Off. Ass. Hernaman. Sols. Coppock & Oltham, Stockport.*

WOOLSEY, JOHN, Ironmonger, Gt. Grimsby, Lincolnshire. *Pat. Oct. 16. Nov. 18 and Dec. 23, at 12; Town-hall, Kingston-upon-Hull. Com. Ayton. Off. Ass. Carrick. Sol. Reed, Kingston-upon-Hull.*

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, OCT. 27, 1857.

GALF, RICHARD, Grocer, Skirmett, Hambleton, Bucks. Oct. 24.

FRIDAY, OCT. 30, 1857.

HILL, CHARLES ALEXANDER, Cabinetmaker, Bristol. Oct. 28.

MEETINGS.

TUESDAY, OCT. 27, 1857.

BENTHAM, HENRY APTHORP, Shipowner, Sunderland. Nov. 10, at 12, 30; Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Com. Ellison. (By adj. from Sept. 16) Last Ex.

BLUNDILL, RICHARD, Banker, Hooton, Cheshire. Nov. 17, at 11; Liverpool. *Com. Perry. Div.*
 BLUNDILL, RICHARD, Distiller, Liverpool. Nov. 17, at 11; Liverpool. *Com. Perry. Div.*
 BRAKE, JOHN, Jun., Coal Merchant, Middleton, Northamptonshire. Nov. 18, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Div.*
 BROWN, WILLIAM, Painter, Plumber, and Glazier, Ramsgate, Kent. Nov. 19, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 BUDDEY, CHARLES, Tailor, Basingstoke, Southampton. Nov. 19, at 11:30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 BUGGER, JAMES, Contractor, 38 Vincent-sq., Westminster. Nov. 17, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Div.*
 CARE, WILLIAM RIDLEY, & HENRY FREDERICK SCOTT, Wallsend, Northumberland; in copartnership as Iron Manufacturers and Coke Burners (John Carr & Co.) with John Carr, already adjudged a bankrupt. Nov. 19, at 12; Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. *Com. Ellison. Pur. Div. joint est.*
 CAULTON, GEORGE, Common Brewer, Radford, Nottinghamshire. Dec. 16, at 10:30; Shire-hall, Nottingham. *Com. Balguy. Div.*
 CONGREVE, WILLIAM, Corn and Flour Merchant, Spalding, Lincolnshire. Nov. 17, at 10:30; Nottingham. *Com. Balguy. Last Est. (previously adj. sine die).*
 DOCKREE, JOHN, Wine and Spirit Merchant, Shakespeare's Head, Percival-st., Goswell-st. Nov. 19, at 12:30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 GRESTHORPE, JOSEPH, Builder, Nottingham. Nov. 24, at 10:30; Shire-hall, Nottingham. *Com. Balguy. Div.*
 GITTENS, GEORGE, Ironmonger, 6 Hart-st., Grosvenor-sq. Nov. 17, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Div.*
 GORDON, ALICE, Shipowner, Sunderland. Nov. 10, at 12:30; Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. *Com. Ellison. (By adj. from Oct. 6) Last Est.*
 GRAY, JOHN WALTER, Commission Agent, Corn and Seed Merchant, Bookseller and Stationer, Bishop's Walkham, Southampton. Nov. 19, at 1:30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 GREIG, JOHN PETER MORLAND, Cabinetmaker, 21 Bartlett's-bldgs., Holborn, and Wheatheaf-tyd., Farringdon-st. Nov. 20, at 11; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 GRIFFITHS, EGBERT, Wine Merchant, 118 Fenchurch-st. Nov. 19, at 2; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 HARRIS, CHARLES HENRY, Wholesale Cheesemonger, Goulstone-st., High-st., Whitechapel, also of Carlton-hill-villa, Camden-rd., Holloway. Nov. 20, at 11:30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 HOBSON, JOHN OVERTON, Corn Merchant, Long Sattion, Lincolnshire. Nov. 24, at 10:30; Shire-hall, Nottingham. *Com. Balguy. Div.*
 ISAACS, LEAH (Picard & Co.), Cigar-dealer, 191 Piccadilly. Nov. 18, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 JOPLING, WILLIAM, Linen and Woollen Draper, Wolsingham, Durham. Nov. 20, at 12; Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. *Com. Ellison. Div.*
 LORD, JAMES, Cotton-spinner, Oak-mills, Millgate, Spottland, Rochdale, Lancashire. Nov. 18, at 12; Manchester. *Com. Skirrow. Div.*
 MARSDEN, ANTHONY, & WILLIAM MARSDEN (Marsden Bros.), Shaw and Mantle Warehousemen, High-st., Islington. Nov. 20, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 MOSS, MORRIS, Coach-broker, 22 and 23 Somers-pl., New-rd., St. Pancras. Nov. 20, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 MUDDIMAN, SAMUEL, Shoe Manufacturer, Northampton. Nov. 17, at 11; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Second Div.*
 RANDALL, WILLIAM, Hotel-keeper and Licensed Victualler, New Inn, Maidstone, Kent. Nov. 18, at 11:30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 REYNOLDS, WILLIAM, Draper, Pontypridd, Glamorganshire. Nov. 19, at 11; Bristol. *Com. Hill. Div.*
 REST, CHARLES, Cheesemonger, 38 Surrey-pl., Old Kent-rd. Nov. 20, at 1:30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 SAVAGE, JAMES, sen., CHARLES JOHN SAVAGE, & JAMES SAVAGE, Jun., Shirt Manufacturers, 40 Noble-st. Nov. 17, at 11; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Div.*
 SPENCER, HENRY, Butcher, Ipswich, Suffolk. Nov. 18, at 11; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 SMALLPRICE, HENRY WILLIAM BUND, & HENRY WILLIAM SMALLPRICE (Smallprice & Son), Curriers, Guildford, Surrey, and of Aldershot, Hants. Nov. 18, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div. joint est., and sep. est. of H. W. B. Smallprice.*
 TALBOT, EBENEZER, & SAMUEL GRICE (Severn and Wye Foundry Co.), Ironfounders, Newnarn, Lydney, Gloucestershire. Nov. 19, at 11; Bristol. *Com. Hill. Div.*
 TILLEY, GEORGE, Brewer, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey. Nov. 20, at 2; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 TRISTHAM, HENRY, Broker, Liverpool. Nov. 18, at 11; Liverpool. *Com. Perry. Div.*
 UTTING, FREDERICK JAMES, Ironfounder, Wisbeach, Isle of Ely. Nov. 17, at 2; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Final Div.*
 WHITE, JOSEPH, Shipbuilder, East Coves, Isle of Wight. Nov. 17, at 2; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Div.*

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1857.

BRADSHAW, JAMES, & AARON COLLINSON, Cotton Manufacturers, Burnley, Lancashire. Nov. 20, at 12; Manchester. *Com. Skirrow. Div.*
 BUCK, WILLIAM JAMES, Dealer and Chapman, 5 Shrubland-cottages, Queen's-rd., Dalston, Middlesex. Nov. 23, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Final Div.*
 CAMPTON, ROBERT, & JOHN CAMPTON, Bankers, Whitby, Yorkshire. Nov. 24, at 11; Commercial-bldgs., Leeds. *Com. Ayrton. Div. sep. est. R. Campton.*
 DICKSON, JOHN, Warehouseman and Commission Agent, 48 Bread-st. Nov. 23, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 GODDARD, EDMUND, Provision Dealer, 103 London-wall, 3 Old Jewry, 161 Fenchurch-st., and 17 Aldgate. Nov. 10, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. (By adj. from June 23) Div.*
 HAMBROUSE, HENRY WILLIAM, JOHNSON PHILLIPS, & CHARLES LOWDER, Bankers, Bath; carrying on the business of Bankers, in Milson-st., Bath, and in Bradford and Trowbridge, Wilts. Dec. 3, at 11; Bristol. *Com. Hill. Final Div.*
 HUDDLESTON, MARY, & THOMAS HUDDLESTON, Cabinetmakers, formerly of Nassau-st., now of 16 Berners-st., Oxford-st. Nov. 23, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*

PAPINEAU, WILLIAM (Wm. Papineau & Co.), Manufacturing Chemist, Chemical Works, Harrow Bridge, Stratford, Essex. Nov. 23, at 11:30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 PETTER, EDWARD, & WILLIAM ARUNDRELL OAKLEY, Ironfounders, Barnstaple, Devon. Nov. 11, at 11; Queen-st., Exeter. *Com. Bere. And Acc. & Prof. Debs.*
 POLLARD, THOMAS, & ARTHUR JOHN SYMONDS, Builders, Guildford. Nov. 23, at 2; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Final Div.*
 ROBSON, WILLIAM JAMES, Antimony Smelter, Bowling-green-mews, Kensington-oval, Surrey. Nov. 21, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Evans. Div.*
 SIMMONS, JAMES, Marble Merchant, Bridge-ter., Harrow-rd., Paddington. Nov. 21, at 11; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Div.*
 WINSTONE, FREDERICK, Gold and Silver Pencil Case Maker, 4 St. James-st., Islington; carrying on business at 7 Liverpool-st., Old Broad-st. Nov. 10, 1:30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. (By adj. from Oct. 14) Last Est.*
 WRIGHT, JONATHAN, Shoemaker, Burnley, Lancashire. Nov. 20, at 1; Manchester. *Com. Skirrow. Div.*

DIVIDENDS.

TUESDAY, Oct. 27, 1857.

BRAMOLEY, JAMES, Cotton Manufacturer, Holcombe Brook, Bury. First, 24d. *Hernaman*, 69 Princess-st., Manchester; any Tuesday, 10 to 1.
 CAISTOR, ARTHUR BREARS, Saddle and Harness Maker, 7 Baker-st., Portman-sq. First, 8d. *Edwards*, 1 Sambrook-ct., Basinghall-st.; next three Wednesdays, 11 to 2.
 CLARKE, JOHN WILDING, Seed Merchant, late of Sidcup, Kent, but now of Whitlessa, Isle of Ely. First, 6s. 4d. *Whitmore*, 2 Basinghall-st.; any Wednesday, 11 to 2.
 EMMERSON, JOHN, East India Coffee-house, 225 High-st., Poplar, and of the Green Gate, Plaistow, Essex, Licensed Victualler. First, 5s. 04d. *Whitmore*, 2 Basinghall-st.; any Wednesday, 11 to 2.
 GADD, JOHN LAWRENCE, Linendraper, Whitechapel-rd. First, 1s. 9d. on new proofs. *Edwards*, 1 Sambrook-ct., Basinghall-st.; next three Wednesdays, 11 to 2.
 GOODWIN, GEORGE, Wholesale Clothier, Manchester. First, 3s. *Hernaman*, 69 Princess-st., Manchester; any Tuesday, 10 to 1.
 HENNINGWAY, BENJAMIN (B. Henningway & Son), Fainter and Upholsterer, Derby. First, 4s. 6d. *Harris*, Middle-pavement, Nottingham; next two Mondays, 11 to 3.
 HEWITT, GEORGE ALEXANDER, Chemist and Druggist, Derby. Second, 2s. 6d. *Harris*, Middle-pavement, Nottingham; next three Mondays, 11 to 3.
 HEWITT, THOMAS, Grocer, Ormskirk. Second, 2s. 6d. *Bird*, 9 South Castle-st., Liverpool; any Monday, 11 to 2.
 HOLDEN, ARTHUR, Paper Manufacturer, Heap-bridge, near Bury. First, 10s. *Hernaman*, 69 Princess-st., Manchester; any Tuesday, 10 to 1.
 HOLDEN, JOHN, Cottonspinner, Belmont, Bolton-le-Moors, Lancashire. First, 3s. 6d. *Fraser*, 45 George-st., Manchester; any Tuesday, 11 to 1.
 HUNTER, JAMES, Shipwright, Benscough. Second, 34d. *Bird*, 9 South Castle-st., Liverpool; any Monday, 11 to 2.
 MEE, WILLIAM, Manufacturer of Plain and Fancy Hosiery, Leicester. First, 2s. *Harris*, Middle-pavement, Nottingham; next two Mondays, 11 to 3.
 NOKES, JOSEPH, Glass-cutter, Lower Hospital-st., Birmingham. First, 1s. 2d. *Whitmore*, 19 Upper Temple-st., Birmingham; any Friday, 11 to 3.
 PEART, JAMES (Richard Peart & Son), Bookseller, Bull-st., Birmingham. First, 5s. 8d. *Whitmore*, 19 Upper Temple-st., Birmingham; any Friday, 11 to 3.
 REYNOLDS, JOSEPH JAMES, Mining and Share Broker, 21 Threadneedle-st. First, 4d. *Whitmore*, 2 Basinghall-st.; any Wednesday, 11 to 3.
 ROBINSON, GEORGE JONATHAN, Silk Merchant, Nottingham. First, 3s. 6d. *Harris*, Middle-pavement, Nottingham; next three Mondays, 11 to 3.
 RODGER, THOMAS, Grocer, Attercliffe-cum-Darnall. Second, 4s. 2d. *Brewin*, 11 St. James-st., Sheffield; any Tuesday, 11 to 2.
 STONER, JOSEPH, Grocer, Ormskirk and Southport. First, 6s. *Bird*, 9 South Castle-st., Liverpool; any Monday, 11 to 2.
 STYMES, EDWARD BARNARD, Electro-plater, 422 Strand. First, 3s. 6d. sep. est. *Edwards*, 1 Sambrook-ct., Basinghall-st.; next three Wednesdays, 11 to 2.
 WALKER, BARNET, Cabinetmaker, Sheffield. First, 14d. *Brewin*, 11 St. James-st., Sheffield; any Tuesday, 11 to 2.
 WOODHOUSE, JAMES THOMAS, Scrivener, Leominster, Herefordshire. Second, 1s. *Whitmore*, 19 Upper Temple-st., Birmingham; any Friday, 11 to 3.

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1857.

BARTON, JOHN, Silk Manufacturer, Manchester. First, 94d. *Hernaman*, 69 Princess-st., Manchester; any Tuesday, 10 to 1.
 COWAN, JOHN, Cheesemonger, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. First, 1s. *Baker*, Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; any Saturday, 10 to 3.
 DECKWORTH, WILLIAM, Cotton Manufacturer, Accrington. First, 4s. 3d. *Hernaman*, 69 Princess-st., Manchester; any Tuesday, 10 to 2.
 FORSTER, BENJAMIN, Draper, Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Wallsend. Second and Final, 2s. 94d., in addition to 2s. 3d. previously declared. *Baker*, Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; any Saturday, 10 to 3.
 HARDACRE, THOMAS, Draper, Settle. Second, 16s., making with former Div. 20s. *Young*, 5 Park-row, Leeds; any day, 10 to 2.
 HERBINS, & BROWNE, Cloth Merchants, Leeds. Third, 4d. *Young*, 5 Park-row, Leeds; any day, 10 to 1.
 HERBIN, ARTHUR OATES, Cloth Merchant, Leeds, and Westminster. Fourth, 3s. 1d. sep. est. *Young*, 5 Park-row, Leeds; any day, 10 to 1.
 HERON, WILLIAM, Cloth Merchant, Huddersfield. First, 2s. 6d. *Young*, 5 Park-row, Leeds; any day, 10 to 1.
 JOHNSON, JOHN, Contractor and Ironfounder, Crook, Durham. First, 13s. 4d. *Baker*, Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; any Saturday, 10 to 3.
 RICHARDSON, JOHN, Jun., Common Brewer, Cockermouth. Third, 34d., in addition to 2s. previously declared. *Baker*, Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; any Saturday, 10 to 3.
 WALKER, JOHN, Commission Agent, Blackburn. First, 1s. 24d. *Hernaman*, 69 Princess-st., Manchester; any Tuesday, 10 to 1.
 WATKINS, GEORGE, Draper, Bolton and Sheffield. First, 4s. 24d. *Hernaman*, 69 Princess-st., Manchester; any Tuesday, 10 to 1.

CERTIFICATES.

To be allowed, unless Notice be given, and Cause shown on Day of Meeting.
 TUESDAY, Oct. 27, 1857.

BROOK, WILLIAM HARVEY, Cheesemonger, 9 Peerless-pl., City-rd. Nov. 18, at 1; Basinghall-st.

BROWN, WILLIAM, Painter, Plumber, and Glazier, Ramsgate, Kent. Nov. 18, at 11; Basinghall-st.
 BURG, RICHARD, Bookseller, Manchester. Nov. 19, at 11; Manchester.
 COCKERELL, JAMES CHARLES, Dealer in Horses, late of Eaton-row, Pimlico, now of Wandsworth-rd., Surrey. Nov. 18, at 2; Basinghall-st.
 FALCONER, ROBERT, Dealer in Manure, late of 5 Wharf, Kingland-basin, Hertford-rd., Middlesex, at present residing in Debtors' Prison, Whitecross-st. Nov. 18, at 12; Basinghall-st.
 HAMNETT, NATHANIEL RADMORE, Grocer, Cardiff, Glamorganshire. Nov. 24, at 11; Bristol.
 HEMINGWAY, BENJAMIN (B. Hemingway & Son), Painter and Upholsterer, Derby. Nov. 17, at 10.30; Shire-hall, Nottingham.
 HOFMANN, FREDERICK, Merchant and Foreign Importer, late of 44 Basinghall-st., now of 58 Herbert-st., New North-rd. Nov. 17, at 12.30; Basinghall-st.
 ICE, JOHN, Surgeon, Eaton-terrace, Pimlico. Nov. 17, at 11; Basinghall-st.
 ISAACS, LEAH, (Picard & Co.), Cigar-dealer, 191 Piccadilly. Nov. 18, at 1; Basinghall-st.
 RAYMOND, THOMAS FOWLER, Commission Merchant, Liverpool. Nov. 18, at 11; Liverpool.
 SOLOMON, SOLOMON, Tailor, 1 Strand. Nov. 18, at 12; Basinghall-st.
 TYLER, WILLIAM, Dealer in Foreign Animals and Birds, 19 Penton-pl., Waltham, commonly called the Royal Survey Gardens, and of Cringleford, Norfolk. Nov. 18, at 1; Basinghall-st.
 WALBURN, RICHARD, Grocer, Howdon, near Crook, Durham. Nov. 20, at 11.30; Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
 WANG, LORENS THEODOR, Timber Merchant, Sunderland. Nov. 20, at 12.30; Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
 WATRE, WILLIAM, Mantle Warehouseman, 96 Oxford-st. Nov. 18, at 2; Basinghall-st.
 WILLET, RICHARD, Linen and Woollen Draper, Leicester. Nov. 17, at 10.30; Shire-hall, Nottingham.

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1857.

BRAX, JOHN, Coal Merchant, 2 New London-st., and 1 Albert-ter., Albert-rd., Sydenham-pk., Kent. Nov. 20, at 1; Basinghall-st.
 FAIR, JOHN, Ironmonger, Castle-st., Bristol. Nov. 23, at 11; Bristol.
 GOODWIN, GEORGE (George Goodwin & Co.), Woollen Merchant, Manchester. Nov. 20, at 11; Manchester.
 GREAVES, HENRY, Reed and Hauld Maker, Halifax. Nov. 30, at 11; Commercial-bldgs., Leeds.
 HAMILTON, JOHN, & ROBERT HAMILTON, Wire Workers, Halifax, Yorkshire. Nov. 20, at 11; Leeds.
 LLOYD, JOHN, Cattle Salesman, Bryn Salwm, Llandderfel, Merionethshire. Nov. 19, at 12; Liverpool.
 NEWSOME, WILLIAM, & EDWARD WILLIAM HAMMOND, Scribbling Millers and Woollen Manufacturers, Staincliffe, Batley, Yorkshire, and Goose Hill, Heckmondwike. Nov. 23, at 11; Commercial-bldgs., Leeds.
 PAPINEAU, WILLIAM (Wm. Papineau & Co.), Manufacturing Chemist, Chemical Works, Hartow Bridge, Stratford, Essex. Nov. 23, at 11.30; Basinghall-st.
 SPENCER, JOSEPH BLAKLEY, Joiner and Cabinet Maker, Halifax, Yorkshire. Nov. 20, at 11; Commercial-bldgs., Leeds.
 SUTTON, HENRY, Builder, Wootton-st., Roscoe Town, Plaistow Marsh Essex. Nov. 20, at 12; Basinghall-st.

To be DELIVERED, unless APPEAL be duly entered.

TUESDAY, Oct. 27, 1857.

BOOTH, GEORGE ROBINS, Engineer and Furnace Builder, 9 Portland-pl., Wandsworth-rd. Oct. 9, 2nd class.
 CLARKE, WILLIAM, Dealer in China and Glass, King's Lynn, Norfolk. Oct. 22, 2nd class.
 DAVIES, THOMAS, Contractor, Neath, Glamorganshire. Oct. 23, 2nd class.
 DAVIS, WILLIAM, & WILLIAM HENRY DAVIS (W. Davis & Son), Drapers, Haverfordwest. Oct. 23, 1st class.
 JORDAN, JAMES, Jun., Builder, 3 Campden-hill, Kensington. Oct. 22, 1st class.
 LOW, ABRAHAM, Cattle Salesman, Lower Homerton, Middlesex. Oct. 23, 2nd class.
 SMITH, GEORGE ARCHER, Brick and Tile Maker, and Scrivener, late of Peterborough and Warrington, Northamptonshire; then of Bacup, Lancashire; afterwards of the Isle of Man; next of Manchester; and now residing at 12 Chapel-st., Bedford-row. Oct. 23, 2nd class.
 TALBOTT, EDWARD, & SAMUEL GRICE (Severn and Wye Foundry Co.), Ironfounders, Newnarn, Lydney, Gloucestershire. Oct. 23, 1st class to E. Talbott.
 THOMPSON, EDWIN, Innkeeper, Lydbrook, Gloucestershire. Oct. 23, 2nd class.

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1857.

ARMSTRONG, JAMES, Linen and Woollen Draper, Berwick-upon-Tweed. Oct. 27, 3rd class; subject to suspension until Dec. 26, 1858.
 BENNETT, THOMAS, Miller, Derby. Oct. 27, 3rd class.
 HUTHESAL, JOHN, Chemical Manure Manufacturer and Schoolmaster, Altrincham, Cheshire. Oct. 23, 2nd class.
 JONES, THOMAS, Grocer, High-st., Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorganshire. Oct. 26, 2nd class.
 LORD, JAMES, Cotton Spinner, Oak Mills, Millgate, Spottland, Rochdale, Lancashire. Oct. 22, 1st class.
 MURSTON, THOMAS BURDICK, Dyer, Leicester. Oct. 27, 2nd class.
 MURPHY, SAMUEL, Innkeeper, Litchurch, Derbyshire. Oct. 27, 3rd class.
 WEST, SAMUEL (in partnership with Frederick Baxter, under firm of Tilson & Co. Lace Makers), Nottingham. Oct. 27, 2nd class to S. West.
 WHARTON, RALPH, Machine Maker and Engineer, Nottingham. Oct. 27, 2nd class.
 WHARTON, SAMUEL, Ironfounder, Nottingham; late of Chesterfield, Derbyshire. Oct. 27, 2nd class.
 WINNING, WILLIAM, Smallware Manufacturer, Wirksworth, Derbyshire. Oct. 27, 2nd class.

Professional Partnership Dissolved.

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1857.

FEMBERTON, WILLIAM AUGUSTUS SADLER, & FREDERICK MOOJEN, Attorneys and Solicitors, 8 Southampton-st., Bloomsbury; by mutual consent. Oct. 27.

Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

TUESDAY, Oct. 27, 1857.

O'REILLY, JAMES, & MATTHEW ARTHUR DILLON (Nottingham Lace Co.), 32 Anglesea-st., Dublin. Sept. 30. Trustees, W. Ross, Warehouseman, 16 Fleet-st., Dublin (who hath disclaimed the trusts); J. Fisher, Warehouseman, Cripplegate-bldgs., London. Sol. Mardon, Christchurch-chambers, 99 Newgate-st.
 PHILLIPS, JOHN, Contractor and Shopkeeper, Cwmduw-house, Cwmduw, Monythuslywyne, Monmouthshire. Oct. 21. Trustees, S. Scard, Provision Merchant, Newport, Monmouthshire; H. Gregory, Brewer, Newport. Sol. Greenwood, Pontypool, Monmouthshire.
 POTTER, GEORGE, Farmer, Hazlewood, Sutton, Tadcaster, Yorkshire. Oct. 21. Trustees, J. Bickerdike, Spirit Merchant, York; J. Whitley, Gent., Bramham, Yorkshire. Sol. Campion, Goodramgate, York. Creditors to execute on or before Jan. 21 next.
 PRICE, JANE ALEXANDER, Boatbuilder, Gt. Yarmouth, Norfolk. Oct. 18. Trustee, S. Darby, Timber Merchant, Beccles, Suffolk. Sol. Holt & Son, Gt. Yarmouth. Creditors to execute within three months from the date.
 PRODDER, WILLIAM, sen., Plumber, Eastbourne, Sussex. Oct. 9. Trustees, J. Nicholson, Lead Merchant, Cousin-l., Upper Thames-st., London; E. Baker, sen., Miller, Eastbourne. Sol. Coles, Eastbourne.
 TOPPING, JONATHAN, Joiner, Penrith, Cumberland. Oct. 12. Trustee, N. Wilson, Timber Merchant, Morland, Westmoreland; C. Varty, Auctioneer, Penrith. Creditors to execute within three months from his date. Indenture lies at office of C. Varty, Penrith.

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1857.

BERRY, SAMUEL, & HANNAH SWIFT, Milliners, Huddersfield, Yorkshire. Oct. 8. Trustees, J. Sunderland, Cooper, Huddersfield; J. Denham, Linendrapers, Huddersfield. Sol. Clough, 37 Market-st., Huddersfield.
 BOGLE, WILLIAM BARNETT, Hop Merchant, Birmingham. Oct. 3. Trustees, J. Scott, Accountant; R. Harvey, Commercial Traveller; both of Birmingham. Sol. Bartlett, Birmingham.
 DENT, JOHN WILLIAM, Licensed Victualler, Twelve Bells, Bride-la, Fleet-st. Oct. 5. Trustees, W. Potter, Licensed Victualler, Gt. Charlotte-st., Blackfriars-rd.; J. Dyer, Gent., 37 Charington-st., St. Pancras. Sol. Bartley, 4 Bartlett's-bldgs. Creditors to execute within three months.
 FLOWERDAY, CHARLES JAMES, Innkeeper, Dog Inn, Norton, Suffolk. Oct. 24. Trustee, E. Stannard, Farmer, Brownston-cum-Bellon, Suffolk; T. M. Lark, Farmer, Durg-castle, Suffolk. Sol. Cusade, Howard-st., Gt. Yarmouth.
 HARMSTON, EDWARD WATSON, Ironmonger, Newark-upon-Trent, Nottinghamshire. Oct. 2. Trustee, J. Bell, Bank Manager, Newark-upon-Trent; J. Knight, Accountant, Newark-upon-Trent. Sol. Hodgkinson, Newark-upon-Trent.
 LANE, EDWARD, Cheesemonger, 58 Cannon-st. Oct. 3. Trustees, J. Lunham, Provision Merchant, High-st., Southwark; J. H. Rickenham, Provision Merchant, 22 Beer-la, City. Creditors to execute on or before Dec. 3. Indenture lies at 22 Beer-la, Gt. Tower-st.
 RICE, GRIFFITH THOMAS, Woollen Draper, 17 Marylebone-st., Regent-st. Oct. 28. Trustees, H. Bidgood, Woollen Draper, 7 Vigo-st., Regent-st., F. Harrison, Woollen Warehouseman, Bow Churchyard. Sol. Richards, 16 Warwick-st., Regent-st.
 TURNER, WILLIAM HENRY, Licensed Victualler, Boar's Head Tavern, Redcliff-st., Bristol. Oct. 14. Trustees, J. Abrahams, Wine and Spirit Merchant, Bristol, and R. A. Green, Brewer, Holcombe, Somersetshire. Sol. Bevan and Gilling, 3 Small-st., Bristol.
 TUCK, GEORGE, Cattle Dealer, Buntingham, Lincolnshire. Oct. 14. Trustee, G. Mears, Gent., Gainsborough, and G. Roadley, Farmer, Scotter. Sol. Plaskitt, Gainsborough.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1857.

BILHAM, ROBERT (who died in April, 1854), Farmer, late of Stow Bedon, Norfolk. Creditors to come in and prove their debts or claims on or before Nov. 19, at V. C. Stuart's Chambers.

Winding-up of Joint Stock Companies.

TUESDAY, Oct. 27, 1857.

UNLIMITED, IN CHANCERY.

SHEERNESS WELL OR WATERWORKS COMPANY.—A petition for the dissolution and winding up of this Company was presented, on Oct. 12, by John Gorham and Frederick Barnard, which will be heard before V. C. Wood on the next petition day.—Hooker & Buttanshaw, Sols, 154, Within's-la.
 SHIPOWNERS' TOWING COMPANY.—A petition for the dissolution and winding up of this Company was presented, on Oct. 27, by John Masson, Gent., Chappel-st., Grosvenor-sq., the Chairman, pursuant to a resolution of the Board of Directors, which will be heard before V. C. Kinsersley on Nov. 6, or on the then next petition day, at 10, in open court, at Lincoln's-inn.—Anfory, Travers, & Smith, Sols., 25 Throgmorton-st.
 LIMITED, IN BANKRUPTCY.

LONDON, HARWICH, AND CONTINENTAL STEAM PACKET COMPANY (Limited).—Mr. Com. Goulburn will proceed, on Nov. 12, at 11, at Basinghall-st., to settle the list of contributories.

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1857.

UNLIMITED, IN CHANCERY.

UNITED GENERAL BREAD AND FLOUR COMPANY FOR PLYMOUTH, STONEHOUSE, AND DEVONPORT.—A petition for winding up this Company was presented, on Sept. 16, by Thomas John Hewitt, Corn Merchant, Plymouth, and will be heard before V. C. Wood, on the first day for hearing petitions, at Michaelmas Term, 1857.—Clowes, Son, & Hickley, 10 King's Bench-walk, Inner Temple, Agents for Edmonds & Sons, Plymouth, Sols for the Petitioner.

Scotch Sequestrations.

TUESDAY, Oct. 27, 1857.

DURNO, JAMES, Farmer, Slieh, Drumblade. Nov. 3, at 12, Gordon Arms Inn, Huntly. Sep. Oct. 24.

FRIDAY, Oct. 30, 1857.

M'HAFFIE, MICHAEL JAMIESON (Michael M'Haflie & Co.), Merchant, Glasgow. Nov. 3, at 12, Faculty Hall, St. George's-pl., Glasgow. Sep. Oct. 24.

on,
 or
 so-
 by
 C.
 St.
 of-
 on-
 in-
 on-
 st.
 edy.
 -st.
 us-
 any
 ant,
 for
 leg,
 onn,
 and
 /Sep